DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 818 UD 028 495

TITLE	Hate in the Ivory Tower: A Survey of Intolerance on College Campuses and Academia's Response.
INSTITUTION	People for the American Way, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Deer Creek Foundation, St. Louis, MO.
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	79p.; Support also received from the Cummins Engine Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	People for the American Way, 2000 M St., N.W., #400, Washington, DC 20036 ($9.95; quantity price negotiable).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Discipline Policy; *Educational Environment; Ethnic Bias; Freedom of Speech; Higher Education; *Hostility; Institutional Research; Racial Bias; *School Policy; School Surveys; Social Problems; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Intolerance

ABSTRACT

A study of institutional responses to incidents of intolerance on college and university campuses was conducted. A questionnaire was sent to the deans of student affairs and student newspaper editors at 128 four-year colleges and universities; and interviews were conducted with administrators, students, faculty, and staff from 58 institutions, 11 of which were also represented by the questionnaire. The following findings are discussed: (1) campus intolerance is more widespread and more entrenched than the number of hate-motivated incidents would suggest, with 57 percent of the institutions acknowledging that intolerance posed a problems on campus; (2) many institutions exacerbate the problems of intolerance by contributing to a "culture of denial," either by not dealing with the problem at all or responding with shortsighted or ill-considered measures; and (3) colleges' immediate responses to hate-motivated incidents have been uneven, inconsistent, and frequently ineffective, with 23 percent of the schools that did report an incident stating that there was either no formal response or a very limited one. The study also reports on an approach that does not work--restricting the expression of racist and otherwise intolerant speech. This effort is not only unconstitutional but also shortsighted in that it fails to change the underlying attitudes that motivate the incidents. Included are 155 endnotes. Three appendices provide the study survey, a breakdown of the data, and a directory of materials collected at the campuses. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340818

HATE IN THE IVORY TOWER

A SURVEY OF INTOLERANCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES AND ACADEMIA'S RESPONSE

People For the American Way

UD 028 495

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Leurquin

People for American Way

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

People For the American Way thanks the Cummins Engine Foundation
and the Deer Creek Foundation
for their generous support of this project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

People For the American Way's survey of 128 four-year colleges and universities found that responses to incidents of campus intolerance, and efforts to challenge the attitudes that propel these incidents, are uneven at best. While some schools confront intolerance directly and comprehensively, many either deny the problem or suggest that limited countermeasures will suffice. Faced with a bias-related incident, many schools avoid searching for the cause of the problem and instead turn to quick-fix solutions. Too many schools abdicate their most basic role -- to educate, to teach students to think critically and challenge easy answers and assumptions. Some responses, such as restrictions on free speech, may actually contribute to an atmosphere of intolerance, and to an impression that some basic rights can be short-circuited to protect others.

The survey of 128 institutions includes research conducted in two parts. The first part consisted of a questionnaire sent to deans of student affairs and student newspaper editors at four-year colleges and universities. Part two consisted of interviews with administrators, students, faculty and staff from 58 institutions, 11 of which were also represented by the questionnaire. Findings reported by percentages or numbers represent conclusions from the questionnaire only.

People For the American Way reports the following:

* Finding 1: Campus intolerance is more widespread, and more entrenched, than the number of hate-motivated incidents would suggest. Fifty-seven percent of the colleges and universities responding to our questionnaire acknowledged that intolerance posed a problem on campus, and 59 percent reported that an incident of intolerance had happened on campus within the past 18 months. These incidents are only the most explicit manifestations of underlying attitudes that breed tension and misunderstanding. Yet some colleges resist dealing with the problem.

* Finding 2: Many colleges and universities exacerbate the problem of intolerance by contributing to a "culture of denial." Some colleges resist dealing with the problem altogether, and others have responded with little more than shortsighted or ill-considered measures. Of those schools that reported an incident of intolerance on the questionnaire, nearly two-thirds reported having either a limited program in place to combat racism and other forms of intolerance, or no program at all. Of the schools that reported no incidents, four out of five described either no program or a very limited one. A university's inadequate response to the broad issues of intolerance may contribute to an atmosphere in which some students feel unwelcome.

* Finding 3: Colleges' immediate responses to hate-motivated incidents have been uneven, inconsistent, and frequently ineffective. Of those schools reporting an incident, 23 percent said there

was either no formal response from the institution or a very limited one. While a few college administrators are making genuine efforts to acknowledge and confront the long-term issues, some administrators ignore the incidents, and others respond in a limited fashion.

People For also reports on an approach that does not work -- restricting the expression of racist and otherwise intolerant speech. This effort is not only unconstitutional, but also shortsighted in that it fails to change the underlying attitudes that motivate the incidents.

People For also issues a set of recommendations for fundamental reform. People For urges all colleges and universities to:

* Conduct surveys and studies to identify specific problems or tensions on campus.

* Provide the information necessary to challenge myths and change attitudes, especially with regard to admissions policies and affirmative action.

* Review recruitment and admissions policies to ensure that every possible effort is being made to reach out to traditionally underrepresented students and faculty.

* Encourage faculty to expand their curricula to include traditionally neglected cultures and perspectives.

This report describes findings from the questionnaire and interviews, and also reviews material published by organizations, college and university task forces and committees, and newspaper, magazine and journal articles. We have collected material from 32 colleges and universities describing their efforts to address these issues. This clearinghouse contains, among other items, surveys of student attitudes, proposals for curriculum transformation, syllabi for ethnic studies classes and recommendations for university-wide reform.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ... 5

SECTION I: Survey Findings ... 7

Finding 1: Campus intolerance is more widespread, and more entrenched, than the number of incidents would suggest. ... 8
Finding 2: Many colleges and universities exacerbate the problem of intolerance by contributing to a "culture of denial." ... 13
Finding 3: Colleges' immediate responses to hate-motivated incidents have been uneven, inconsistent, and frequently ineffective. ... 18

SECTION II: An Approach that Doesn't Work: Sacrificing Free Speech in the Name of Fighting Intolerance ... 22

SECTION III: Recommendations for Fundamental Reform ...26

Step 1: Evaluating the Problem ... 27
Step 2: Challenging Myths and Changing Attitudes ... 30
Step 3: Student and Faculty Recruitment ... 35
Step 4: Curriculum Review ... 37

CONCLUSION ... 42

ENDNOTES

APPENDIX A: The Survey

APPENDIX B: Survey Breakdown

APPENDIX C: Directory of Materials

"Many believe that racism can be dealt with effectively in one
hellifying workshop, or one hour-long heated discussion. ...
I've run into folks who really think that we can beat this devil,
kick this habit, be healed of this disease in a snap.
In a sincere blink of a well-intentioned eye,
presto -- poof -- racism disappears.
'I've dealt with my racism ... now I can go to the beach'."

Gloria Yamato,
essay in
Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras:
Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color,
edited by Gloria Anzaldua. (1)

INTRODUCTION

In recent months, escalating tensions at our nation's colleges and universities have shaken our faith in the idyllic college campus, where students are supposed to study and learn unburdened by problems beyond the campus gates. Evidence of strain and divisiveness is everywhere -- from overt acts of bigotry to an increasingly acrimonious debate over the content and ideology of course curricula. But headlines and scattered reports fail to do justice to the full significance of campus conflict.

Beneath each well-publicized incident lies the far more complex challenge posed by persistent social intolerance based on race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and religion. And it is becoming increasingly clear that America is not adequately prepared for the challenge. The growing polarization on campuses is nothing less than a reflection of the problems facing the country as a whole. Not since the days when millions of immigrants passed through Ellis Island has this country had to reconcile its commitment to pluralism with such a rapidly changing citizenry.

In the coming decades, growing numbers of women, people of color, immigrants and ethnic Americans will be assuming positions of prominence and responsibility previously closed to them. Their influence will have a profound impact on the nation's future. The Hudson Institute reported, in *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*, that "[W]hite males, thought of only a generation ago as the mainstays of the economy, will comprise only 15 percent of the net additions to the labor force between 1985 and 2000," and that "the small net growth of workers will be dominated by women, blacks and immigrants."(2) These changes taking place within our country's borders mirror changes occurring worldwide as the increasingly global economy is forcing nations to understand and communicate with cultures and peoples on continents around the world. Yet America marches toward the future with little recognition that these changes require new approaches and understanding.

The rise in hate crimes in recent years is perhaps the most dramatic warning that America will not accept its increasing diversity without tension. Blacks, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, women, gays and lesbians have all been victimized by this new surge of hate-motivated violence and harassment. But to many of these groups, the attitudes underlying these crimes -- the narrow view that diversity is a threat, not an opportunity -- is even more troubling than the crimes themselves.

Nowhere is this clash of values more clear than on our college and university campuses. America's colleges and universities have long been a crucible of conflict and change, charged with preparing young people for the future and for leadership roles in their communities. Yet as this report shows, these institutions are not fulfilling their responsibility to defuse tensions and foster

mutual respect by educating students about the ways in which race, ethnicity and gender have influenced American society.

It is disturbing enough that the number of hate-motivated incidents is increasing on college campuses, as in the rest of society. It is more troubling when colleges fail to respond effectively, because they are sending a message that an institution of higher education has no role in changing the attitudes that motivate and abide these incidents.

If our educational institutions are to meet the challenges of the next century, they must address the reality of diversity in this country and the tensions that accompany it. Just as colleges and universities train students in writing, critical thinking and computer literacy, they must also attend to "multicultural literacy" -- an understanding and appreciation of American diversity. Failure to do so will result in workplaces and communities rife with misunderstanding and conflict, just as we are seeing on college campuses today.

This document, a national survey of colleges and universities, found that responses to incidents of intolerance, and efforts to challenge the attitudes that propel these incidents, are uneven at best. Some colleges confront the incidents and the deeper attitudes directly and comprehensively. But many others deny the problem, suggest that limited countermeasures will suffice, or worry about ways to contain damage to their reputations. Faced with a bias-related incident, many schools avoid searching for the cause of the problem and instead turn to quick-fix solutions. In doing so, they abdicate their most basic role -- to educate, to teach students to think critically and challenge easy answers and assumptions. Some responses, such as restrictions on free speech, may actually contribute to an atmosphere of intolerance, and to the false impression that some basic rights can be short-circuited to protect others.

While it is disheartening to discover so many schools denying the problem and not educating about it, we also recognize that some are beginning to take significant and positive steps. Perhaps most important, some schools are attempting to incorporate diversity into their core values, so that programs, courses and hiring practices reflect multiculturalism when relevant. Unfortunately, these are few and far between. As Karen Rowe, director of the curriculum transformation project at the University of California at Los Angeles, said in an interview with People For the American Way, colleges can no longer consider it a "luxury" to acknowledge the realities of our diverse society.(3) This report will outline the full range of our findings -- from the culture of denial at some universities to the bold programs other schools are putting into place.

SECTION I: SURVEY FINDINGS

Finding 1: Campus intolerance is more widespread, and more entrenched, than the number of hate-motivated incidents would suggest. Fifty-seven percent of the colleges and universities responding to our questionnaire acknowledged that intolerance posed a problem on campus, and 59 percent reported that an incident of intolerance had happened on campus within the past 18 months. These incidents are only the most explicit manifestations of underlying attitudes that breed tension and misunderstanding. Yet some colleges resist dealing with the problem.

The People For survey establishes that the campus intolerance problem runs deeper than a particular incident of verbal harassment, swastika daubing or physical assault. It is a problem of underlying attitudes and institutional responses. How a college organizes its residential life, curriculum, admissions and administrative procedures sends a powerful message about the value it places on diversity, and whether the campus environment will be friendly or hostile to minorities.

Many students, faculty, administration and staff are fully aware that the number of reported incidents alone does not constitute the full measure of the problem. An administrator at Western Kentucky University responded to our survey, "[W]hile we rarely encounter blatant intolerance, we do incur subtle institutional intolerance."(4) Jonathan Poullard of the Office of Multicultural Affairs at Susquehanna University responded:

> ... For Susquehanna University the problem is one of subtlety and silence ... Contributing factors to incidents are low levels of awareness among students and faculty, not enough resources to combat these issues seriously, and not enough support from the administration to aid in the process.(5)

An administrator from Swarthmore College wrote:

> It is not an overt problem for the most part ... but there is quite a bit of separatism and underlying tension -- the reason it's not overt may be that we have such a strong tradition of political liberalism. [This] keeps views in check, [and] may also contribute to some of the underlying feelings.(6)

All of the campus newspaper editors who returned the questionnaire agreed that intolerance posed some degree of problem on campus. As a group, they were generally critical of college efforts to combat the problems, and none reported a comprehensive institutional program designed for this purpose. All reported at least one incident, and reported limited to no formal institutional response, or said they were unaware of such a response.

Intolerance, whether it is manifested in overt incidents or by attitudes and climate, strikes

blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, women of all races and ethnicities, Jews, lesbians and gays. Respondents to our survey reported problems and specific incidents across this spectrum. While several reported that problems or incidents of all of these types existed and occurred on campus, some listed the problems more specifically. Of those campuses reporting problems of intolerance on our questionnaire, 30 percent noted tension based on sexual orientation, 24 percent said race, and 17 percent said ethnicity. Of those who described specific incidents of intolerance, 46 percent were based on race, 29 percent on sexual orientation, and 33 percent on gender.

But colleges should not assume that the lack of overt intolerance toward one group means that the group feels like a fully welcome participant in the campus community. Donald Peterson, professor emeritus of the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology at Rutgers University, wrote in "Students Speak on Prejudice: A Survey of Intergroup Attitudes and Ethnoviolent Behavior":

> Nobody escapes. No matter who you are, no matter what the color of your skin, no matter what your gender or sexual orientation, no matter what you believe, no matter how you behave, there is somebody out there who doesn't like people of your kind.(7)

The National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence provides further proof that the problem is widespread. In *Campus Ethnoviolence and the Policy Options*, "[S]ince the Fall of 1986 when the Institute began monitoring ethnoviolence on college campuses, incidents have been reported publicly at approximately 250 colleges and universities."(8)

At the same time, it would be unfair to label campuses that have been the sites of racist, antigay or otherwise bigoted incidents as uniquely "intolerant" campuses. The picture that emerges is more complicated. A college that reports tension may be the one making a concerted effort to broach the issues of difference and intolerance. As Raymond Goldstone, dean of students at the University of California at Los Angeles, said in an interview with People For, "[I]n fact, there may be a correlation between how much noise there is and how tolerant a place is."(9)

The Institute for the Study of Social Change at the University of California at Berkeley provides an example in its recent report, "The Diversity Project," written by Troy Duster, director of the Institute. It describes a controversy surrounding what kind of music would get played during prime hours on the college radio station. "[R]ather than seeing the radio battle as 'racism' or 'pathology,'" the report notes, "it is more fruitful to see this as a healthy battle over scarce resources. It is healthy because differing groups with differing interests are battling it out about who should have those resources.(10)

As traditionally underrepresented groups become more visible on campuses, they become targets for explicit and subtle forms of intolerance. Although the news media tend to report on particular incidents, the attitudes behind the incidents are often more troubling and cause the greatest problems for minority students and other victims.

According to the Berkeley report on diversity, members of various ethnic groups must face not only the usual stresses of academic and social expectations, but also the corrosive influence of ethnic stereotypes prevalent on campus. Asian Americans, for example, face the "double edge" of being labeled a "model minority" at the same time they are criticized for being "academically narrow, grade grubbers, parochial, clannish. ..."(11) African American students expressed "the sense that they were subjects of scrutiny and silent discrimination by professors, TA's and other students."(12) Paraphrasing the comments of one Native American student, the report reads, " [R]acism ... surfaces in two contexts: either in the complete denial of responsibility by white students for any privilege that they enjoy, or their colossal ignorance about Native Americans."(13) And, according to the report, "[F]rom the moment that they learn of their admission to Berkeley, Chicano/Latino students become aware of white perceptions that they are at Cal not because of their talent and personal achievements but because of Affirmative Action." The report repeatedly notes the effect these perceptions and attitudes have on students' lives at the university. For example, the author writes of the impact on the Chicano/Latino students, "[T]hey openly discussed how these comments devastated them emotionally, lowered their self-esteem, and often made them internalize other's perceptions of them."(15)

While campus intolerance is manifested in many ways, most often it is a result of close-minded attitudes that generate tension, fear and misunderstanding. Interviews and reports revealed that one of the greatest sources of campus intolerance came from attitudes and misunderstandings about affirmative action.

In an interview with People For, Susan Rasmussen,(16) affirmative action planning officer at the University of Michigan, said that when she talks to students about affirmative action, "the first topic that comes up is 'reverse discrimination.'" She and other administrators interviewed pointed out that it is not necessarily affirmative action itself, but rather the misconceptions about the way the program is applied and implemented, that creates tension. Or, as the Berkeley "Diversity Project" documented in June 1990, the "controversy over Affirmative Action colors much of the substance of ethnic and racial relations within and between groups, and penetrates in diffuse and indirect ways social and academic life."(17) The report explains that, "[T]he operating assumption among many of the white and Asian students that we interviewed is that Black, Chicano/Latino, and Native American students don't 'belong' at Cal."(18)

White student unions (WSU's) represent perhaps the most extreme manifestation of this misunderstanding about affirmative action and the resulting reaction among white students. It is a case, we believe, of the extreme shedding light on the norm. White student unions are officially registered at Temple University, the University of Florida at Gainesville,(19) and the University of Southwestern Louisiana at Lafayette, the latter calling itself the Society for Euro-American Rights, Culture and Heritage (SEARCH).(20) And according to the *Washington Times*, organizers claim that "unofficial white student unions are active or organizing on nearly a dozen other campuses in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Massachusetts and Wisconsin."(21)

Leaders of white student unions claim that minorities now receive preferential treatment when applying to schools and jobs. Southwestern Louisiana student Doug Hernandez, a leader of the effort to organize a white student union at the university, told People For the American Way, "[I]f you're a minority, you're pretty much guaranteed a job or an internship just because you're a minority, not necessarily because you're the best man for the job."(22)

Although white student unions offer resistance to affirmative action as the rationale for their groups, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that deep-seated bigotry also plays a role, as these excerpts from *The White American*, the student newspaper of the Temple University WSU, demonstrate:

> We are White. We will not apologize for that or ever compromise it. We will always be White, our children will be White, and our descendants will be White. ...
> As long as one White man and one White woman grace this planet, there shall exist love of our race and culture. Our movement for equal rights for whites shall always live.
>
> ---
>
> There are times when people of diverse racial backround [sic] may become emotionally or sexually attracted to one another. ... The strong minded individual will value his or her race as much (if not more than) their immediate gratification.(23)

While actual membership of each WSU appears to be small, these students claim that many more students support them privately. Mark Wright, president of the WSU at the University of Florida, said in an interview with People For the American Way, "[People] tell me, 'I want to support you but I want to work in the fire department,' or, 'I want to run for political office.'"(24)

Students may not always organize their resentment under labels as blatantly reactionary as "white student unions," although the anti-affirmative action message remains the same. According to interviews and accounts of the controversy in the campus newspaper, white students at Michigan State University have established a new student organization called "No Equality Through Ine-

quality" (NETI).(25) They did so in response to a sit-in organized by students of color to demand, among other things, more minority staff and faculty.

Some white students in NETI have accused university officials of capitulating to unfair minority student demands. One NETI organizer was quoted in the campus newspaper, the *State News*, as stating that, "[W]e feel the University bowed down to the protesters." He added: "Our first and foremost goal is equal rights. We want the administration to know there is another side to both the protest and the equal rights movement on campus. We want to ensure that our voice is heard."(26)

Nor are faculty members immune to demagoguery on this issue. As more and more universities consider expanding curricula to include traditionally underrepresented or even excluded cultures, literatures and perspectives, some protesting faculty members have responded by heating up the rhetoric in ways that prey on conflicting views about multiculturalism and affirmative action.

For example, the National Association of Scholars (NAS), an organization dedicated in part to fighting curriculum reform, has plans to launch an effort directed against what it calls "academic affirmative action" -- with particular venom pointed at women's and black studies.(27)

At the University of Texas at Austin, opposition formed to a proposal for a new writing course built around the history of discrimination and legal efforts to remedy it. Linda Brodkey, professor of English, outlined the controversy in several interviews with People For the American Way.(28) Despite significant faculty support for the course, some opponents called it too political. According to an article in the *Austin Chronicle*, the Texas Association of Scholars, an NAS affiliate, gathered faculty signatures for a petition, called "A Statement of Academic Concern," and later published it as a print advertisement.(29) The statement said that the new curriculum "distorts the fundamental purpose of a composition class ... by subordinating instruction in writing to the discussion of social issues and, potentially, to the advancement of specific political positions."(30)

Typical was the reaction of Alan Gribben, a history professor at UT, who told the *New York Times* that the course was unnecessary because "universities, by definition, are multicultural institutions. Anytime a student takes a foreign language course or studies Renaissance Spain or learns about ancient Greece, he or she is having a multicultural experience."(31) The implication was that the university would be fulfilling its obligation to help students examine the world outside this country's borders if it offered courses on Renaissance Spain and foreign language classes.

Clearly, the sources of prejudice and the subsequent problems facing one group may be quite different from those facing another. Women experience harassment ranging from "innocent" comments on the street to outright sexual assault. Lesbian and gay students must deal with a mentality that views their sexual orientation as immoral and abnormal, as reflected in a letter to the editor of *Cougar Pause*, the College of Charleston newspaper, calling homosexuality "an abnormality that

should be treated."(32) The result, however, is the same. Racism, homophobia, sexual harassment, perceived admissions quotas, demagoguery on curriculum reform -- all tell certain people that they are not welcome or important in a community because of their race, religion, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation or other difference from the "norm."

Finding 2: Many colleges and universities exacerbate the problem of intolerance by contributing to a "culture of denial." Some colleges resist dealing with the problem altogether, and others have responded with little more than shortsighted or ill-considered measures. Of those schools that reported an incident of intolerance on the questionnaire, nearly two-thirds reported having either a limited program in place to combat racism and other forms of intolerance, or no program at all. Of the schools that reported no incidents, four out of five described either no program or a very limited one. A university's inadequate response to the broad issues of intolerance may contribute to an atmosphere in which some students feel unwelcome.

Survey respondents agreed on a few major reasons for the problem of intolerance on campus. First, college marks the first time many students go to class with, eat with, and live with large numbers of students different from themselves, whether the difference is one of race, national origin, sexual orientation, age or disability. As Donald Peterson of Rutgers University observed in a presentation to the National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology:

> Many of these students grew up in segregated communities with their own cultures of prejudice. In the university, they are thrown together in an inherently competitive situation. For the first time, they are required to confront others whom many were taught all their lives to hate, fear, and despise. ...
> ... no social scientist I know ever predicted that the transformation from a restrictively segregated university society to the competing diversities we see today would occur without conflict.(33)

Second, economic pressures and competition are much greater today than in the 1960s, the period often used for comparison when sizing up this college generation. Competition for college admission and post-graduate employment is intense, a college education costs more, and students often carry heavy burdens of debt when they leave. Some students perceive the increased competition for admissions and jobs to be at least partially the result of affirmative action programs.

Third, students entering college today grew up at a time of increasing racial polarization in our country. In the 1980s, minorities were labeled "special interests," and prominent politicians worked actively to roll back affirmative action and civil rights laws. One administrator from Kutztown University in Pennsylvania observed on the questionnaire:

> The intolerance that is so rampant is largely due to the fact that most of our students come from highly segregated environments and their first experience with difference is on the campus. This college generation has been referred to as 'Reagan's children.' I think the values of that period will be a problem for a long time to come.(34)

These factors certainly play an important part. But colleges and universities should consider their own contribution to the problem. Perhaps most damaging is the way many deny the problem. This denial sends an implicit message to the college community that the issue need not, and perhaps should not, be raised.

The National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence confirms in its report, *Campus Ethnoviolence and the Policy Options*, that denial is common:

> ... many college administrators initially responded by simultaneously denying the existence of a problem on their campus and re-defining the incidents that occurred as "pranks," isolated incidents, or as nonprejudiced in motivation.(35)

The first question on People For the American Way's survey was, "Is intolerance based on race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or gender a problem on your campus? If yes, can you identify any contributing factors? If no, can you suggest why this is so?" Several answered with a simple "No," but did not go on to explain what factors contributed to this enviable environment. Thirty-one of the surveys claimed intolerance was not a problem. Nine claimed "no problem" and then went on to describe at least one incident of intolerance. At Memphis State University, the incidents were "bomb threats by telephone to historically black fraternities."(36)

Discomfort with or lack of knowledge about an issue adds to this "culture of denial." Several survey respondents noted specifically that fear of AIDS, or lack of exposure to openly gay men and women, for example, contributed to homophobia on campus. Two others said their institutions were affiliated with religious denominations that considered homosexuality immoral. One of these respondents, from Baylor University in Texas, observed, "[T]he university is a Baptist institution and is morally/religiously opposed to homosexual practices. Students with homosexual orientation would likely experience discomfort here."(37)

Some schools may use a group's silence or absence as an excuse for not confronting problems facing that group. Several who said on the questionnaire that intolerance was not a problem suggested that the small size of the college or the homogeneity of the student body may be factors. One administrator from the University of Alaska, in interviews with People For the American Way, said the university does not tolerate any form of intolerance, and responds strongly when in-

cidents occur. Of an anti-gay incident several years ago, however, she said that the university did not specifically address the homophobic nature of the incident because, "[W]e don't have a large gay activist [community, so] we'd be remiss to go in the opposite direction and make it an issue." (38)

Another method of denial was to point fingers at the rest of society. One administrator, from a university in Colorado, who asked that the school not be identified, wrote, "[T]he contributing factor is not necessarily campus related, but rather the result of the intolerance pervasive throughout our society."(39) Another, from Hamilton College in New York, wrote "[T]here are underlying problems but not any more so than on other campuses or with other populations."(40)

Those who fail to see the illogic of such arguments -- the absence of a particular population or the extent to which the bigotry reflects the problem in society as an excuse for not confronting the problem -- need only look to the University of Maine at Farmington. William Geller,(41) director of educational services, said in an interview with People For the American Way that two years ago, the campus climate was such that gays and lesbians did not feel comfortable identifying themselves publicly. But the administration made a concerted effort to encourage discussion of homosexuality among the entire student body, and to provide support services for gay and lesbian students. Geller quickly admits that the campus is nowhere near being free of homophobia, but the effort did force students to confront the matter. Several lesbian students have since identified themselves publicly, through letters to the student newspaper and political activism.

That the bigotry on campus reflects the bigotry in society is true enough -- but not enough. If the prejudice mirrors the attitudes of society, so does the clearly inadequate response. College presidents, faculty, administrators, students and their proud parents all like to describe the college experience in idyllic terms. We hear, over and over, that the goal of education is to open minds and train students to ask questions, think critically. But across the country, many administrators are not doing this themselves when it comes to intolerance on campus. Instead, they point to racism and sexism and homophobia off campus as an excuse for not dealing with it on campus, or they suggest that one incident (or more) does not add up to a problem.

The problem on many campuses, however, runs deeper than their unwillingness to confront it. Administrators and educators may need to take a hard look at how the institution's administrative policies and procedures contribute to intolerance on their campuses.

Paul Glasser,(42) dean of the School of Social Work and chair of the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes at Rutgers University, offered an example of such a policy, which the university is working to correct. He said some students receive Economic Opportunity Funding

(EOF) from Rutgers, which covers tuition and some expenses, and that many, but not all, of these students are minorities. Sometimes, payments were delayed for administrative reasons, and when these students tried to register for classes, they would be told they could not do so until their tuition was paid. These students were then forced to run bureaucratic circles to document that all was in order. Glasser admits this "disproportionately inconveniences students of color." This effect, while clearly not intentional, shows how even policies that seem far removed from issues of intergroup relations may be insensitive to the lives and needs of some students.

Historically, prejudice has often been manifested in the admissions procedures of a college or university. Recent allegations suggest that some selective colleges and universities have attempted to limit the numbers of Asian American students admitted. L. Lin-chi Wang, chair of the ethnic studies department at the University of California at Berkeley, reported some of this evidence in the *Urban Review*:

> The [California auditor general's] report revealed that during the period covered in the audit, whites "gained admission to Berkeley's five colleges at rates that were higher in general than those of Asians" in spite of the superior academic qualifications of Asian American applicants.(43)

He notes that the University of California at Los Angeles also may have attempted to cap Asian admissions. He claims that a confidential UCLA planning paper said:

> This campus will endeavor to curb the decline of Caucasian students. A rising concern will come from Asian students and Asians in general as the number and proportion of Asian students entering at the freshmen level decline - however small the decline may be.(44)

Some admissions officers and administrators, when challenged, have said that while Asian American students are competitive academically, they are not by other standards. In the *Yale Law Journal*, Grace Tsuang writes, "[A]dmissions officers have claimed that Asians participate in fewer extracurricular activities in high school than their Caucasian counterparts, and have characterized Asian applicants as 'one-dimensional.'"(45) She continued, however, that "Stanford, which assigns each applicant a 'non-academic rating' based on extracurricular achievements, found generally that even when Asians and Caucasians received the same non-academic rating, Asians were still admitted at a lower rate to the Class of 1989."(46)

Tsuang also refutes the claim of some admissions officers that Asian Americans score lower on "personal ratings."(47) She cited a Brown University study, which reported that "Asian applicants received comparatively low personal ratings, but concluded that the unjustified low ratings

are due to the cultural biases and stereotypes which prevail in the admissions office."(48)

Institutional resistance also has cropped up in cases involving sexual harassment and sexism, despite considerable evidence that women face widespread and deep-rooted bias and intolerance. Donald Peterson's report for Rutgers, "Students Speak on Prejudice," found that "offenses against women, ranging in severity from embarrassing remarks to rape, were most commonly reported." This atmosphere invades the classroom, too. The Project on the Status and Education of Women, a project of the Association of American Colleges, shows that women undergraduates "are called on less often than men students," and that "those women students who do make an effort to participate may find that their comments are disproportionately interrupted by teachers and by male classmates, and/or that faculty are less likely to develop their points than those made by men students."(49)

Nevertheless, some college administrators appear to narrow the issue of sexism to that of rape, which represents only the most extreme manifestation of the problem. And even when colleges do address rape and sexual assault issues, they too often treat them solely as security problems, not as the expression of attitudes as deeply ingrained as racism or other forms of intolerance.

In *Ms.*, author Kathleen Hirsch writes, "[O]n many campuses, the penalty for rape is identical to, or less severe than, the sanctions for plagiarism -- one year's suspension."(50) She continues:

> In case after case of campus rape, university officers rely on administrative judicial boards that mete out absurdly lenient punishments; they fail to file criminal complaints in an effort to ward off bad publicity; and they largely succeed in creating the impression that crimes against women are aberrations in otherwise civilized communities devoted to the refinement of the mind.(51)

When colleges and universities respond to such a deep-rooted problem by ignoring and dismissing it, they fail in their role as educators. Students leave college without changing or even challenging the attitude that Letty Pryor, director of the women's center at the University of Maine in Farmington, described in an interview with People For the American Way: "If it happens in Kansas, it doesn't relate to us; if it happens here, we don't believe it."(52)

Reluctance to acknowledge and confront the uglier side of an institution is understandable. But it is difficult to imagine a victim of intolerance receiving a sympathetic hearing from administrators who, in the face of such blatant expression, deny the existence of racism, sexism and homophobia. Administrators must realize that violence of this sort is only the most extreme manifestation of prejudice. If some members of the community feel comfortable expressing intolerance in

physically or verbally abusive ways, chances are good they or others will not balk at expressing their bias in more mundane but equally harmful ways.

Finding 3: Colleges' immediate responses to hate-motivated incidents have been uneven, inconsistent and frequently ineffective. Of those schools reporting an incident, 23 percent said there was either no formal response or a very limited one. While a few college administrators are making genuine efforts to acknowledge and confront the long-term issues, some administrators ignore the incidents, and others respond in a limited fashion.

The survey revealed the full gamut of responses. Nearly a quarter of the returned questionnaires reported no formal response or a very limited one to specific incidents. An administrator at Harvey Mudd College in California wrote on the questionnaire of an incident of violence against a female student, and said the dean's "formal response" was that the woman provoked the man. Of another, anti-gay, incident, the administrator said the dean was "outraged." The administrator reported that the cases were handled privately, but reported no specific judicial procedure.(53)

Other schools take limited action, but clearly could do more. According to interviews and newspaper clips, the University of Georgia responded to several acts of racial and ethnic intolerance in the last half of the 1989-90 academic year with increased security, and a letter from the president to the student newspaper condemning racism and intolerance.(54) Students also responded by forming the Myers Hall Racial Awareness Task Force. But Vanessa Williams, assistant director of minority services and programs, told People For the American Way that she found the response unsatisfactory.(55) She said the "incident was not isolated," but "reflects a widespread attitude." She added, "[T]he administration is overly optimistic, and what they think is going on is different from what actually is happening."

Some colleges, like the ones described below, make more of an effort to look at the problems that helped contribute to such an incident. Some use one-on-one counseling, others bring in a variety of campus leaders and organizations, and others create ongoing task forces or intervention teams. Many of these responses are helpful and constructive. Yet, we emphasize that unless coupled with a long-term program aimed at the attitudes and assumptions underlying the larger problem of intolerance, they will be little more than band-aid solutions to ugly incidents.

Sensitivity Workshops

In the spring of 1990 at the University of Kansas, according to the *Daily Kansan*, a fraternity member "struck and uttered a racial insult to" a black female student who was delivering pizza.(56) This incident sparked a protest by students, who occupied the administration building. David Am-

bler, vice chancellor for student affairs, said in an interview with People For the American Way that because the student conduct code stipulates that the university has jurisdiction over students only in on-campus incidents, the administration could not take any action against the fraternity member directly in this case.(57)

University officials met with minority students to hear their grievances, and last spring instituted a series of changes in response to the incident. This fall, according to Ambler, more than 450 leaders of major student organizations, administrative staff and faculty have attended cultural sensitivity workshops. He added that the fraternity system is in the process of organizing similar workshops for members. University officials created an advisory board to the Office of Minority Affairs, and promised to upgrade minority recruitment. Ambler said the university also is considering changes in the western civilization course sequence "to make it more inclusive of a wider range of literatures and cultures." While supportive of the effort, he adds that "until it is built into the curriculum and mandated for students, anything else will be a drop in the bucket."

Using Video as an Educational Tool

Some colleges use the video *Still Burning* as a tool for prompting discussion about intolerance, and for advice on how to respond to acts of intolerance.(58) Produced by the University of Maryland Baltimore County, there are two versions -- one for administrators, staff and resident assistants, and one for students in general. Both open with a scene of students defacing another student's room with racial slurs and threats. The video for students continues with a discussion in which black, gay and lesbian, and women students discuss their reactions.

Lenora Barnes-Wright, director of the Office of Black Student Affairs at the College of Wooster, told People For the American Way that the college has used the video extensively.(59) Residential staff, student affairs people, student organizations, security, faculty, clubs and others have viewed it, and she added that the college's response to intolerance "has largely come out of some of the concepts in the video." When someone burned a cross on the campus last year, administrators informed the residential life staff, the black student community and student leaders, and moved quickly to remove the cross. Barnes-Wright said, "Those were things that come straight out of *Still Burning*." She added that they were still learning, however, and noted an oversight, saying they "didn't call in the Jewish student community, and we should have."

Support Groups and Conflict Resolution

At the State University of New York at Brockport in the fall of 1989, a gay male student was harassed by other students in the cafeteria. Joseph Franek, director of residential life, told People

For that the university has in place a "RACE Team" (Racial Awareness through Campus Education), made up of a cross section of students, faculty and administrators, which acts as a resource and support group when incidents occur, and conducts workshops.(60) In this case, according to Franek, the victim met with a representative of the RACE Team, and decided not to pursue any disciplinary action.

Joel Tolliver, SUNY Brockport's director of the multicultural center for student services and development, in an interview with People For, said the center provides counseling for students in academic, financial and personal areas, and also offers workshops on subjects including personal self-esteem, work habits, decision making, mediation and multi-cultural awareness.(61) The university has also received funding from the New York Martin Luther King Institute for Nonviolence to train students in "cultural sensitivity and awareness and mediation." As part of this, six students will be trained in conflict resolution and mediation. They will then be available to train other college students, as well as students in secondary schools. Whereas the RACE Team conducts educational workshops and provides counseling after an incident, this new program is designed to give students the skills to avoid and mediate conflict on their own, "on the spot," according to Tolliver.

Peer Counseling

In response to student pressure after several incidents of sexual harassment, Princeton University established the Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources and Education program (SHARE) in 1987.(62) According to a published description of the program, SHARE recruits and trains 20-25 students to work as peer educators who, along with trained resident advisors, lead short information and discussion sessions on acquaintance rape with all first-year students during orientation week. The office also provides individual and group counseling for survivors of sexual assault and advice on disciplinary and legal options.(63) According to SHARE's 1988-89 annual report, between the program's first and second year of operation, the number of individuals seeking counseling increased from 50 to 200.(64) According to the *Daily Princetonian*, this increase led to new demands by students that the university provide another full-time staffer, which the university rejected.(65)

Task Forces

Those colleges with white student unions have resisted any possible temptation to ban them, preferring instead to stay true to their mission of educating. Arthur Sandeen, vice president of student affairs at the University of Florida, told People For that the university intentionally has few requirements for registering a group.(66) "We have an obligation to promote their freedom of ex-

pression and right of association," he said, and added, "[W]e'll make sure they don't violate any discrimination or intimidation laws."

Instead, Florida and Temple are looking at ways to address the issue of racial tolerance through educational means. At the University of Florida during the 1989-90 academic year, the Task Force on African-American and Hispanic Students, which met weekly during the late winter/early spring of 1990, issued a report calling on the faculty to investigate how to incorporate issues of cultural diversity into their courses.(67) "Education helps to change the negative attitudes and behaviors that result in racism, prejudice, and misconceptions about how to live and work comfortably with diverse groups," the report reads.(68) The task force proposed developing a "general education interdisciplinary elective class ... to examine, address, and discuss the multicultural diversities of race and ethnic groups and the practical fears and frustrations that different groups have and believe about each other."(69)

James Fitzsimmons, associate dean of students at Temple University, said in an interview with People For that Temple is also approaching the issue of racism from an educational perspective. Over the summer, the Educational Policies Planning Committee investigated ways to integrate discussion of cultural differences into the curriculum. Fitzsimmons said they will present a proposal to the faculty senate this fall.

Education and Counseling

Denys Blell, formerly dean of minority affairs and associate dean of student affairs at Case Western Reserve University, supports the use of education and counseling, believing it more likely to change some minds and attitudes than would punishment.(71) In an interview with People For the American Way, he described a complaint regarding a racist remark made by a white student that was overheard by a black student. Blell said it was "taken through the disciplinary process," which recommended that he mediate first, with the understanding that more action could be taken if it was not resolved satisfactorily. He met with both students and worked to show the white student "how he had hurt the black student, himself, and the campus environment." Blell said the white student clearly felt "really embarrassed," that "both healed," and the charges were dropped.

Blell said that others take "disciplinary action far too often," and that "you don't set examples by executing people." At the same time, he sympathized with the frustration of students of color. He said the "African American population is fed up with this nonsense ... [and are] cynical about the white male's readiness to change."

SECTION II: AN APPROACH THAT DOESN'T WORK: SACRIFICING FREE SPEECH IN THE NAME OF FIGHTING INTOLERANCE

Among the most controversial methods of responding to intolerance on campus are conduct codes designed to ban the expression of racist and otherwise intolerant speech. Even some students and faculty who support taking a strong stand against intolerance advocate these regulations. Colleges must consider whether, in enacting such codes, they have abrogated their responsibility to protect free expression, and whether, in reality, they have hindered the effort to promote mutual respect.

The University of Connecticut was forced to ask itself these questions after a student challenged its code banning "slurs or epithets based on race, sex, ethnic origin, disability, religion or sexual orientation."(72) According to the *New York Times*, this student had posted a sign on her door that said, in part, "homos" were not allowed. Expelled under the new code, she sued, and eventually the university settled the case, agreeing that the language was too broad and infringed on free expression.(73) Although still potentially problematic, the code has since been narrowed somewhat to ban:

> ... personally abusive epithets which, when directly addressed to any ordinary person are, in the context used and as a matter of common knowledge, inherently likely to provoke an immediate violent reaction, whether or not they actually do so. Such words include, but are not limited to, those terms widely recognized to be derogatory references to race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability, and other personal characteristics.(74)

Even colleges that respond relatively effectively to incidents of intolerance, and are aware of the First Amendment issues involved, may enact codes that specifically restrict racist and otherwise intolerant speech. The University of Kansas has, along with a number of other initiatives, "established, approved, and published" a new "Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy," according to David Ambler, vice chancellor for student affairs. He said "lawyers pored over this policy," and that it was written with every intention of safeguarding First Amendment freedoms.(75) Lenora Barnes-Wright, from the College of Wooster, said that a recent incident on campus moved the college to revise its code in an attempt to prohibit certain explicitly racist or otherwise intolerant expression.(76)

As demonstrated by the case at Connecticut and one at the University of Michigan, these codes waste precious resources. They most likely do little to sensitize the perpetrators of intolerant acts, and others who share their views, about prejudice and bigotry. Instead of fostering a community where all feel free to speak and challenge, these codes achieve several rather more destructive ends. First, they shift the issue from intolerance to the limits of the First Amendment and the definition of offensive speech, thereby allowing perpetrators to wrap their intolerance in the Constitution. Second, they give institutions an easy out, suggesting that prohibition of words, rather than education about underlying attitudes, will eliminate bigotry. And third, these codes demonstrate a

willingness to sacrifice, if not surrender, one principle for another, rather than live with the difficulties of believing in both.

On April 12, 1990, a panel convened by the Annenberg Washington Program of Northwestern University echoed this view.(77) The group, which included civil rights and civil liberties lawyers, scholars, judges and university administrators, concluded that "most attempts to deal with racist and sexist expression through restrictive and punitive measure are problematic from a First Amendment point of view -- they do not address the root causes of the problems of racial prejudice and sexism, and may, in fact, be counterproductive."(78) The panel supported the use of education and counselling in place of these regulations.

The report explains:

> ... although there have been occasional incidents of derogatory communicative behavior on our campuses consisting of direct, face-to-face intimidation (some would also use the term harassment), tantamount in law to a verbal assault, which can and should be punished without damage to the First Amendment (or to the spirit of the First Amendment in the case of private schools), there are many more which are so entwined with the expression of political, religious or social points of view that they should not trigger any disciplinary response at all, or are in a sufficiently gray area between the extreme of intimidation/harassment/assault and political/religious/social opinion that the response of an educational institution should be counselling rather than punishment or, as one member put it, "interaction, not sanctions."(79)

Others who have looked at the broader problem of campus intolerance agree with these conclusions. The Carnegie Foundation, in its report, *Campus Life: In Search of Community*, cited the response of Derek Bok, president of Harvard University, to a sexist act:

> ... Whom will we trust to censor communications and decide which ones are "too offensive" or "too inflammatory" ... As a former president of the University of California once said: "The University is not engaged in making ideas safe for students. It is engaged in making students safe for ideas."(80)

At the same time, Bok did not shy away from his obligation to remind the community what principles it valued and promoted. He condemned the act and those involved in no uncertain terms, adding that his condemnation "does not infringe on free speech ... [but is] part and parcel of the open debate that freedom of speech is meant to encourage."(81)

The Supreme Court, in the 1942 case, *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, ruled that the First Amendment does not protect "fighting words," which it defined as words that "by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace."(82) Some colleges, including Stanford, the University of California, Pennsylvania State and the University of Wisconsin, have enacted policies that attempt to prohibit only expression that meets this definition.(83) But as Ira Glasser, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, explained to *The Nation*, these policies similarly violate the First Amendment. "We think they are all unconstitutional. ... Freedom of speech is being made the scapegoat for problems the people in power don't know how to solve."(84)

The Annenberg report comes to much the same conclusion. Of "fighting words" policies, it states:

> [T]his rationale is troublesome because punishment for the utterance of slurs and epithets is dependent upon whether targeted individuals are likely to respond with physical violence, which is generally not the case in instances of racial and sexual harassment. ...(85)

The report concluded that colleges and universities should make it known that "discriminatory *conduct* based on race, religion, ethnicity, sex and sexual orientation will not be tolerated on the campus and that rules against such *actions* will be vigorously enforced," but that colleges should avoid codes banning certain types of *speech*.(86)

The ACLU has filed challenges to several restrictive speech codes, and succeeded in 1989 against one of the most encompassing, enacted by the University of Michigan in 1988.(87) Previously prohibiting "any behavior, verbal or physical, that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, creed, national orientation, ancestry, age, marital status, handicap or Vietnam-era veteran status,"(88) it has since been trimmed to bar "physical acts or threats or verbal slurs, invectives or epithets, referring to an individual's race, [etc.] ... made with the purpose of injuring the person to whom the words or actions are directed."(89)

In short, schools looking for a shortcut through the First Amendment toward the difficult goal of fighting intolerance forget the obligation to foster a climate of acceptance and open debate. In fact, such a shortcut is an abdication of this responsibility, a white flag that says muffling the worst about and among us is the best we can do.

SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDAMENTAL REFORM

Some colleges not only are responding to incidents of intolerance, but are rethinking the most basic aspects of college life, acknowledging that multiculturalism only *begins* with a more diverse student body. The real work is in reforming the campus environment to ensure that all are welcome and equal members of the community. People For the American Way has collected reports, surveys, descriptions of orientation programs and first-year seminars, syllabi from "transformed" classes, and other materials from 32 colleges and universities. These materials stand as substantive evidence that dedicated faculty, administrators, staff and students can work for change.

This work must span both the short- and long-term. Preparing for the short-term begins with the assumption on the part of the university leadership that intolerance exists on campus. Procedures should be in place that allow for quick and consistent response to incidents, and every member of the community should be aware of the proper channels for filing and pursuing a complaint. Colleges should encourage students to report hate crimes to both the campus and the local police. As of January 1991, the Justice Department will collect these reports as part of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, signed into law by President Bush in April 1990.

Preparing for the long-term involves tackling the issue in four ways: 1) evaluating the current climate on campus to determine exactly what values and principles the institution wants to promote, and how the institution will communicate this message; 2) getting the message out, through programs and projects like resident assistant training, new student orientations, workshops, special events and lectures; 3) reviewing and extending the recruitment and admissions procedures, to be sure the college is reaching out to traditionally underrepresented groups, and that the procedures for reviewing applications are fair; 4) encouraging faculty to expand their curricula to include traditionally neglected cultures and perspectives.

The examples described below were selected as examples of creativity and innovation in the area of fundamental, long-term reform. Though large universities are conducting many of the projects described later in the report, the University of Maine at Farmington, a rural campus of 2500, is implementing one of the most innovative. Many of these programs are still in the development stage, and probably none can be called an unqualified success. But, however imperfectly, they are raising the questions and facing the challenges.

Step 1: Evaluating the Problem

Recommendation: Conduct surveys and studies to identify specific problems or tensions on campus.

* The University of California publishes "The Diversity Project," a survey of student attitudes about issues of race and ethnicity on campus.

* Rutgers publishes several studies about university life for lesbian and gay students, and another, more general survey about prejudice and intergroup attitudes among students.

* The University of Massachusetts at Amherst publishes a study of the campus climate from the perspective of lesbian and gay students.

* The University of Wisconsin at Madison publishes a summary of reported complaints of harassment and intolerance.

* The University of Maryland at College Park supports research, conducted by the counseling center, on student attitudes about intergroup relations.

A good first step for an institution may be an attempt to gauge exactly what the climate on campus is. This can help identify current problems and provide a standard for comparison as programs are developed and implemented. Some of these reports, including that of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, provide outlines of goals and corresponding timelines.

One of the most extensive studies regarding student attitudes and intergroup tension is the University of California at Berkeley's Institute for the Study of Social Change report, mentioned several times previously. As a result of this study, called "The Diversity Project: An Interim Report to the Chancellor," the university community has a clear portrait of the problems, and some common-sense, feasible suggestions. The report, which was released in June 1990, finds that affirmative action is the issue around which a great deal of misunderstanding spreads. The report suggests that the university work to "reformulate the discourse about Affirmative Action."(90) It also suggests, in part, making a stronger case that "quality" and "diversity" are not mutually exclusive goals, and emphasizing that the Academic Index (GPA and SAT scores) is only "one principle of excellence."(91) One of the most common-sense suggestions came from students:

> They routinely suggested that the university sponsor events where ethnicity and racial harmony and exchange are "side effects" of the event. ... In these settings, something else occupies the primary attention, and the students look over and see that the student next to them is of a different group. It is in these settings, they said, that they had their best encounters, their best experiences, and often achieved their closest understandings of real diversity.(92)

Other institutions also have conducted studies, though more narrow in scope. In 1985, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst studied the campus climate from the perspective of lesbian and gay students. "The Consequences of Being Gay: A Report on the Quality of Life for Lesbian,

Gay and Bisexual Students at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst," was prepared by Felice Yeskel for the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.(93) It found that "lesbian, gay and bisexual students experience a range of verbal and physical assault which exceeds that of any other group of students. Overwhelmingly, those students who suffer harassment or discrimination do not report it."(94)

Since then, the university has followed up on some of the recommendations made in the report. Yeskel now directs the Program of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Concerns, established first on a pilot basis, and then formally in 1988. The university also created or continued a number of support and academic services.(95)

Rutgers University has done similar work in this area. In 1987, Dr. Susan Cavin directed the "Rutgers Sexual Orientation Survey: A Report on the Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Members of the Rutgers Community."(96) Spurred by findings similar to those of the University of Massachusetts, then-President Edward J. Bloustein convened the President's Select Committee for Lesbian and Gay Concerns in 1988.(97) Charged with recommending steps to improve campus life for lesbians and gays, the committee released its report, "In Every Classroom," in November 1989.(98) Recommendations included establishing an office for gay and lesbian concerns;(99) providing support to faculty to "develop courses and course modules addressing the lesbian and gay experience from the perspective of all relevant disciplines";(100) and, addressing issues of homophobia through orientation and residence-based workshops.(101)

Rutgers also commissioned a report on prejudice on campus. Released in February 1990, it was called "Students Speak on Prejudice: A Survey of Intergroup Attitudes and Ethnoviolent Behavior Among Undergraduate Students at Rutgers University," and found, among other things, that bias and prejudice crossed every conceivable line, from sex to race to politics.(102) These reports give Rutgers a detailed sense of the problems within the community, and offer solid suggestions for improvement and change. This kind of study will also give the institution a standard for measuring future progress.

In 1988, the University of Wisconsin at Madison issued "The Madison Plan," which described goals and established target dates for accomplishing those goals, in areas from community outreach to faculty recruitment, from the possibility of an ethnic studies requirement to new student orientation.(103) The university also publishes annual progress reports.

The university also published a summary of all the harassment complaints reported to three offices from June 1, 1988 to August 15, 1989. In total, 152 incidents were reported. The introduction says, "[W]e are taking the bold step of making this information public so that we may see the

reality in our own community as a necessary first step to eliminating behavior which damages the educational and work environment at UW-Madison."(104)

The University of Maryland at College Park supports research on these issues through its counseling center. In recent years, they have published: "Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research";(105) "White Student Attitudes Toward Blacks and Hispanics: Programming Implications";(106) "University Student Attitudes Toward Arabs: Implications for Programmatic Intervention";(107) and "Student Attitudes Toward 'JAPS': The New Anti-Semitism."(108)

The university also has developed a "Sexual Harassment Education Resource Manual." It includes sections on the definition, prevention and resolution of sexual harassment, lists contacts for complaints and questions, and provides checklists for both complainants and those accused of sexual harassment. It is distributed to "inform Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors and Department Chairs of their legal and professional responsibilities in preventing and resolving incidents of sexual harassment and to fulfill the policy requirement to educate the campus community about the nature of sexual harassment."(109)

Administrators surveyed acknowledged that these reports and studies are only the first steps in what they hope will be the development of longer-term efforts to address the issues. The college must be prepared to respond to the recommendations and accept the findings. Progress will inevitably be difficult. In August 1990, Rutgers took the controversial step of eliminating ROTC scholarships, on the grounds that the military discriminates against gays and lesbians, despite concern that this could affect only those students most in need of the scholarship money.(110) And the *New York Times* reported that while the University of Wisconsin has met some of the goals outlined in the "Madison Plan," such as improved minority student retention, it is finding others more elusive, such as doubling "the number of [incoming] minority undergraduates to 400 a year," and doubling "the number of minority faculty members by adding 70 within three years."(111)

Step 2: Challenging Myths and Changing Attitudes

Recommendation: Provide the information necessary to challenge myths and change attitudes, especially with regard to admissions policies and affirmative action. Use a variety of media and forums, from application materials to workshops in dorms.

* The University of South Carolina has developed the "Carolinian's Creed," designed to inculcate a shared set of values among the entire campus community.
* Rutgers University, as part of the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes, provides grants to selected student projects that raise issues of bigotry and prejudice.

* The University of Maine at Farmington uses a variety of techniques to encourage students to discuss and confront the issues of sexism and homophobia.

* The University of California at Berkeley trains orientation counselors to dispel misinformation about the purposes and methods of affirmative action programs.

Colleges and universities may believe they promote certain high ideals and values, but many make no effort to ensure that the campus community knows of these values. In an attempt to address this, the University of South Carolina has developed "The Carolinian's Creed."(112) According to Jerry Crotty, associate dean of student development at the university, the code was written last year at the urging of Vice President for Student Affairs Dennis Pruitt, and with the help of an outside organization, the International Values Institute. The creed is basically a "social honor code" that describes the values and expectations the university wants to promote. It reads in part:

> Choosing to join the community obligates each member to a code of civilized behavior. As a Carolinian ...
> - I will practice personal and academic integrity;
> - I will respect the dignity of all persons;
> - I will respect the rights and property of others;
> - I will discourage bigotry, while striving to learn from differences in people, ideas and opinions;
> - I will demonstrate concern for others, their feelings, and their need for conditions which support their work and development.(113)

Since the code is designed to set the tone and climate for the campus, there are no penalties attached to violations of the creed specifically. Rather, Crotty says, it is designed to give "people a vocabulary to confront one another" in difficult situations. Obviously, this is a relatively simple step toward a very difficult and complex goal, but it addresses all the issues in the form of positive shared values and expectations, rather than in the form of a set of minimum standards that will result in disciplinary action if violated. Further, it sends the message that the university believes that "differences in people, ideas and opinions" should be included among the positive features of college life and education, not a negative by-product.

Crotty said that last spring, the college gathered 65 student leaders, and introduced the creed to them. During "Preview Week" this past summer, entering students participated in a colloquium, during which they watched the "freshman follies." These were "vignettes" of situations that first-year students may face, and covered alcohol abuse and acquaintance rape, among other subjects. The students then split into small groups to discuss the skits, and were introduced to the creed

then. The college will present the creed at Fall Convocation, and circulate copies to student organizations and around campus. The creed will also be discussed in some sections of "University 101," a first-year seminar.(114)

Though orientations and residence-based workshops are perhaps the most common ways of raising intolerance issues with students, or with faculty, administration and staff, they may also be the most limited. As Gloria Yamato wrote in an essay, "Something About the Subject Makes It Hard to Name," racism cannot be eliminated in the course of a workshop or discussion. Administrators would do best to consider orientation the time to raise questions and challenge assumptions and stereotypes, rather than the opportunity to change attitudes that have developed over years.

Since orientation takes place at the beginning of the first year, when many students feel overwhelmed, it is important to make the message about the value of multiculturalism and diversity sharp and simple. Bruce Barbee,(115) director of orientation at the University of California at Los Angeles, sees orientation as an opportunity to counter one of the most corrosive myths on campus -- that affirmative action benefits minorities at the expense of whites. He said he wants students to walk out thinking, "I belong here, and I feel reasonably confident that I will succeed here." UCLA's orientation counselors (mostly juniors and seniors) are trained to address this issue, armed with facts designed to counter myths about affirmative action and "special admits." Barbee said the "myth is that anybody who comes in through affirmative action does not meet the qualifications for admission." In reality, he said, approximately 98 percent of students admitted meet these qualifications, and "special action" admits constitute another category -- those admitted for "special talents or abilities" in, for example, music or athletics.

Administrators can spread this information in a variety of forums. Susan Rasmussen,(116) affirmative action planning officer at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, offered similar advice based on her experiences with students. When she talks to students about affirmative action in "informal workshops," the "first topic that comes up is 'reverse discrimination.'" She explains to them numerical and admissions realities. Approximately 15,000 white candidates apply for admission; 7500 are accepted. Approximately 800 black students apply; 500 are accepted. She points out to students that there "has always been affirmative action" in the form of seeking musicians, athletes and others whose talents and abilities would benefit the community as a whole. She said "[I]t's not just a straight numbers game ... not just a magic combination" of GPAs and SAT scores. She said that the "facts can be persuasive," and that for many students, this is the first time the information is presented accurately.

Countering these myths and demonstrating the commitment to diversity requires an ongoing effort, however, rather than relying simply on workshops during orientation or in the dorms.

Rutgers University has established a program that attempts to change attitudes and prove the institution's commitment by involving students, administrators, faculty and staff, and using a variety of approaches to achieve these goals.(117) Organized under the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes, the work is divided among ten task forces in charge of projects including: curriculum development; recruitment and retention of minority students, faculty and staff; and grants, projects, awards and research.(118) Each task force designs and implements its own projects. Part of the program distributes grants to student projects that "seek to celebrate the diversity of our community by eliminating bigotry and prejudice." In 1987-88, projects funded included: *Asian Faces*, a literary magazine; a Latin American film and lecture series; a lecture program on prejudice and racism in American sports; and a video of a day in the life of a disabled student.(119)

Several administrators acknowledged that because it has taken the committee a couple of years to find its way, students might be skeptical of its work. As one attempt to remedy this, each task force has designed one goal that can be accomplished by the end of the fall 1990 semester.(120)

It may seem counterproductive to raise issues and questions when there have been few, if any, overt expressions of intolerance on a campus. But the university has the obligation to address these issues even if they are not manifest openly on the campus itself.

The approach implemented at the University of Maine in Farmington demonstrates that asking the questions may indeed raise tensions, but it does not create them, and the only hope of changing attitudes and expectations is to deal with them directly. The University of Maine, according to William Geller, director of educational services, has 1900 full-time students from "small Maine communities....They hold generally conservative views and traditional values."(121) In his response to People For's survey, he observed that intolerance based on sexual orientation and gender were particular problems, which he said stemmed from "lack of awareness which parallels the ignorance ... in society."(122) The university, however, was not content to shrug off the problems of the rest of society. In a series of efforts to initiate discussion of these issues, the university confronted homophobia, sexism and other forms of intolerance.

Geller provided People For with a handout he developed for a presentation on the university's efforts.(123) It describes the steps taken by the college to combat homophobia among the entire student body, and to provide academic, social and emotional support services. The administration worked to ensure that those who availed themselves of this support could do so in confidence.

In 1987-88, the college hired a counselor to deal specifically with gay, lesbian and bisexual concerns; started a support group; and, sent a summer mailing addressing the topic. The Women's

Center also sponsored a study group, and the Center for Human Development held a staff workshop on the issues.

In 1988-1989, an open letter was distributed to the campus; the college held resident assistant training; and an outline for student personnel staff was distributed. A weekly discussion group, open to anyone, was held on the issues. The group drafted a Declaration of Support and distributed it in dining halls and other well-traveled areas. The group also set up a table to collect signatures of support. In addition, a person with AIDS spent a week living on campus, to raise awareness and educate students about the disease. Geller said that prior to 1988-89, there were no openly lesbian or gay students on campus. After this program, several lesbians felt comfortable enough to identify themselves publicly, one through an article in the campus newspaper and others through academic and political activities. Two set up a display in the library on famous gays, and another led a petition drive for Maine civil rights legislation for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

In 1989-1990, students received material on the issue in their orientation packets during the summer; an attitude survey, previously sent with the packet, was conducted during orientation; faculty and staff were given the same attitude survey; the support group and the study group continued; the Declaration of Support and the signatures were distributed; students conducted a discrimination survey and discovered that students think the greatest discrimination is against homosexuals; and, English 101 classes included writing assignments that address issues around homosexuality.

To cover the broader range of prejudice and intolerance, the college developed a strategy to deal with the following issues: multiculturalism/racism; nutrition/wellness; alcohol/drugs; community volunteerism; gay/lesbian; male/female relationships, and AIDS/safer sex. The tactics, described in a paper provided by Geller, included:

1) A statement or question, projected daily on a screen in a busy area on campus. For example:

> The jury said she deserved to be raped by the way she dressed. What do you say?

2) Similar messages, changed daily and posted on the inside of bathroom stall doors.

> Sexual harassment is not defined by the intentions of the accused. ... It is defined by the effect on the victim. ...
> (Maine Human Rights Commission)

3) A bulletin board set up in a high traffic area. The theme changes weekly.

4) A monthly tabloid of students' personal experiences about any one of the social issues. It is handed out personally on meal-center lines.

5) A list of questions pertaining to each of the social issues, to be used in some of the writing assignments in first year English classes.

> Describe your feelings about homosexuality and what factors have influenced your perceptions of homosexuality over the years.

6) A working group, open to anyone, for each social issue. The group has a budget and designs and implements activity pertaining to the social issue.(124)

The University of Maine shows that going public can indeed change attitudes and make a community more hospitable for groups and individuals that may have been quiet or even absent in the past.

Step 3: Student and Faculty Recruitment

Recommendation: Review recruitment and admissions policies to ensure that every possible effort is being made to reach out to traditionally underrepresented students and faculty.

* The University of Michigan runs the King/Chavez/Parks Program, designed to attract a more diverse student body to the university.

* A committee at the University of California at Berkeley reviews the institution's admissions policies, and encourages the university to continue and even extend its efforts to recruit traditionally underrepresented students.

As demonstrated by protests over affirmative action and the controversy surrounding possible caps on Asian American admissions, admissions policies or perceptions about them may contribute to a sense among some students that they are not fully welcome on campus -- and among others that certain students should not be welcome. Sometimes, rhetoric far exceeds reality, as in the perception of some that affirmative action programs are flooding the nation's campuses with black students. A census study released in 1990 reported that while high school graduation rates for black students have increased, the percentage of those graduates going on to college has dropped from 30 percent in 1978 to 28 percent in 1988.(125) As the Berkeley report and several administrators noted, institutions must dispel the misinformation students hear and carry around about affirmative action.

Several colleges are working harder to tap into previously ignored applicant pools. Sponsoring "college for a day" visits, summer programs and the like are all small but positive steps toward demonstrating to traditionally underrepresented students that college is a viable and welcoming option. Equally important is recruiting for graduate school. Universities need to provide information about opportunities, and funding options, for graduate study. Duke University has published such a brochure.(126)

This kind of information is necessary if colleges are to correct the dearth of minority and women faculty on campuses today. The American Council on Education reports, in *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity*, that "black representation on faculties in predominantly white institutions is only 1.8 percent. Representation of Hispanics and American Indians in the faculty ranks remains low, in spite of modest overall gains in the last decade."(127) And the Association of American Colleges reports that, "[T]he hiring and promotion of women faculty and administrators has lagged far behind the enrollment of women students, who now constitute the majority of undergraduates and an increasing proportion of graduate and professional students" (128)

In 1987, the Michigan state legislature passed the Martin Luther King, Jr./Cesar Chavez/Rosa Parks (KCP) Educational Initiative. According to the KCP Yearbook,(129) it is designed to increase college attendance by students traditionally underrepresented -- including African American, Hispanic, and Native American students. The three major components -- the Visiting Professors Program, the Fellowship Program, and the College Day Program -- are in operation at the Ann Arbor campus.

The Visiting Professors Program is run by the Office of Minority Affairs, and brings Asian American, African American, Native American and Hispanic scholars and professionals on campus for one day to a full academic year. The yearbook reads, "The KCP Fellowship Program is intended to increase the number of minorities receiving doctoral degrees from Michigan universities and colleges, especially in fields which lack minority representation and to ultimately increase the number of minority faculty in the State of Michigan."(130)

Part of the KCP program is geared toward students from "some 40 public school districts, with the highest number of underrepresented children."(131) The College Day Spring Visitation Program introduces 7-11th graders to "college life and higher education." The yearbook notes, "[D]uring the Spring of 1989, over one thousand middle school and high school students from southeastern Michigan came to the University" under the program. The university ran a similar visitation program for Native American students. The school also followed up with students who visited the university by organizing College Clubs, set up in school districts to "inform students

about various colleges and universities and prepare them for the process of applying to institutions of higher learning ... and, hopefully, dispel any uncertainty as to whether or not college is an option."(132)

The University of California at Berkeley recently reexamined its admissions procedures, and released a report, "Freshman Admissions at Berkeley: A Policy for the 1990s and Beyond." The university is set to implement the new guidelines with the applicants for next fall. A controversial component of the report is essentially an additional category of affirmative action -- "students who come from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds ... open to all disadvantaged students, regardless of race or ethnicity."(133) The goal is to correct the failure of the college to diversify in terms of economic background or status. Ironically, some proponents of diversity worry that this policy could hurt minority students most. The Berkeley "Diversity Project" report notes that since, in California, "there are actually more whites in economic distress than Blacks ... class-based Affirmative Action admissions would therefore inevitably cut deeply into the racial diversity of the campus."(134)

Step 4: Curriculum Review

Recommendation: Colleges and universities should encourage faculty to expand their curricula to include traditionally neglected cultures and perspectives.

* The University of Maryland at College Park and the University of California at Los Angeles run seminars for faculty interested in learning how to incorporate issues of gender and the contributions of women writers and scholars into their curricula.

* The University of California at Berkeley will require students to take one course, from an approved list, that compares at least three of the following five racial and ethnic groups: Latinos, African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans and European Americans. These changes, and other efforts to review curriculum or to implement ethnic studies requirements, have raised controversy on a number of campuses.

* Canisius College in New York and the University of South Carolina integrate discussion of multiculturalism and diversity into more general first-year seminars.

Many universities and colleges are examining their curricula in an attempt to encourage faculty members to include the history, literature, and culture of minority and non-western cultures. Among others, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Irvine, and the University of Washington have recently investi-

gated and debated implementing some form of curriculum transformation or ethnic studies requirement.

The debates have raised a range of questions on campuses. At the University of Washington, the University of California at Berkeley and others, the conflict has been over which ethnic groups should be included. Students and faculty at San Francisco State University questioned the shift of a black studies course from one department to another. At other colleges, faculty have argued that not enough time, space, resources or knowledgeable instructors are available to meet the new requirements.

Many colleges have struggled with these questions since the late 1960s, when they started establishing black and women's studies programs. But in today's unsettled climate, the questions take on an added degree of tension, urgency and symbolism. The controversy surrounding the change in Stanford University's western culture requirement in 1988 was intense and sometimes bitter, although the change was not nearly as dramatic as the debate may have suggested. Instead of the western culture requirement, Stanford students now take one of eight courses offered by the Culture, Ideas and Values (CIV) Program. The major changes, according to Lisa Benton, program administrator for the CIV Program, included dropping the formality of the core reading list, freeing instructors to "[broaden] the scope of works" they can use, and adding one completely new course -- "Europe and the Americas." Faculty still pick a number of books from the old "Great Books" list to provide a "common element" for the year, and students may still take the "Great Books" course.

Renato Rosaldo, professor of anthropology at Stanford, teaches "Europe and the Americas," which includes, according to the syllabus, subject matter about "some European, Native American and African-American sources of American cultures," and "the ways these have co-existed, clashed, and intersected over the past 500 years in the societies of North America, Latin America, and the Caribbean."(135) As Rosaldo sees it, his course teaches about the development of the variety of cultures in America today, and "[S]tudents of these heritages are in the university -- [you] can't have a curriculum that treats them as if they're invisible."

Even more recently, Stanford added a new requirement. Starting in the fall of 1991, students will have to choose a course that examines "topics pertaining to the history, significance and consequences of racial, ethnic and/or religious diversity in the culture and society of the United States," according to a report in the *New York Times*.(136)

A 1988 proposal at Berkeley would have required students to take one of a number of courses that compare at least two of the four following groups: Latinos, Asian Americans, African Ameri-

cans and Native Americans. This proposal was delayed because of division among the faculty. Some protested the exclusion of Americans of European descent as "an ethnic group to be studied."(137) Others were concerned about the logistics of a new requirement. Professor William Muir at Berkeley told the *New York Times*, "[T]here is a great difference between diversifying the curriculum and requiring a course that has never been taught."(138)

At the University of Washington, some faculty and students objected to a proposed requirement of 10 hours of ethnic studies classes for students of the College of Arts and Sciences because it did not deal with anti-Semitism.(139) And at San Francisco State University, according to the *New York Times*, controversy followed a decision to move a black politics course from the ethnic studies school to the political science department. Protesters saw it as "a first step toward eliminating the 20-year-old ethnic studies school," while "[S]chool officials maintain that the course was moved to woo a more diverse student enrollment to the political science department."(140)

Despite these concerns, some colleges have developed multi-faceted programs designed to encourage faculty to review their courses and approaches. The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) is in the process of a curriculum transformation project. Karen Rowe,(141) professor of English and director of the project, sees curriculum transformation as part of an attempt to review "the substance of what is taught," an effort that began in the late '60s and early '70s. She noted the *Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*, published in 1985, the *Heath Anthology of American Literature* and the *Norton Anthology of African American Literature* as benchmarks of this shift in thinking, and of the extent to which ethnic and women's studies have made it into the mainstream.

Rowe said that since the late 1960s, UCLA has made a commitment to exploring new directions for the curriculum. UCLA's Institute of American Cultures has existed since 1969. It includes the American Indian Studies Center, the Center for Afro-American Studies, the Asian American Studies Center and the Chicano Studies Research Center. The university also runs area study centers that concentrate on Latin America, the Pacific Rim and Africa. The university has formally sponsored women's studies specialization since 1975, a major since 1987, and established the Center for the Study of Women in 1984.(142)

The first part of the most recent effort to transform the curriculum began in 1987. Its goal was "incorporating perspectives from women's studies and ethnic studies into large general education courses in the humanities and social sciences."(143) In 1988, the Center for the Study of Women began a new phase, aimed in part at helping faculty rethink their courses and syllabi. For the last two years, Rowe has organized faculty development seminars in several disciplines. Each seminar involved two faculty facilitators, eight to eleven faculty participants, five to seven graduate student

participants, and two research assistants for support. They met three hours weekly for eleven weeks. Each participant was required to produce a "transformed syllabus or new course design." Rowe said the results of this seminar could reach up to 8000 students.

Bruce Schulman,(144) an assistant professor of history at UCLA, took the faculty seminar during the winter quarter of 1990, and reworked "The U.S. Since 1945," an upper division history course with 500 to 600 students. In an interview with People For the American Way, he said he kept the same major topics but changed his approach. For instance, he broadened the segment on civil rights -- once focused exclusively on events at the national level -- to include a section on the grassroots struggle. The course now includes *Coming of Age in Mississippi* by Anne Moody, lectures on case studies of Greensboro, North Carolina, and Tuskegee, Alabama, as well as a study of Fannie Lou Hamer in Mississippi. In another section of the course dealing with studies of youth and delinquency in the 1950s, he now includes material on attitudes toward the conduct of women and girls, whereas previously the section focused only on men and boys.

Schulman said the faculty seminar was especially valuable in that it offered a rare opportunity to "discuss these issues with my colleagues." He was able to learn some new material, discuss pedagogic issues, and work on an essentially "isolated task" with the help of others.

The University of Maryland at College Park is working on a curriculum transformation project similar to UCLA's. In 1988, the Committee on Undergraduate Women's Education, established to build on an earlier study of the education of women at the university, released its report.(145) One of the recommendations was to "develop a summer program for the development of faculty expertise in the scholarship on women and gender, and for the incorporation of the perspectives and contributions of women into the curriculum."(146) The university accomplished this goal with the first Summer Faculty Institute in 1989.(147)

The summer seminar included "fifteen faculty members from ten different disciplines."(148) At the end of the program, Dr. Betty Schmitz, special assistant to the president, developed a bibliography and information packet that included "abstracts of individual faculty projects, a complete schedule of common readings, and reading lists from individual faculty projects."(149)

The report summarizing the results of the summer program categorized changes in three ways:

1. Making explicit issues and questions about women, gender, and other forms of diversity ... that had previously been implicit or absent in textbooks, lectures, assignments, a discussion. ...
2. The inclusion of more materials about women, gender, and difference in readings, lectures, and assignments. ...

3. The introduction of gender as a crucial conceptual category, sometimes challenging traditional paradigms and arrangements of knowledge.(150)

Many other colleges are in the process of proposing, developing and designing requirements in ethnic or gender studies. These requirements have taken a number of forms at different schools and colleges. Some will require a common course; others will require one or several courses from an approved list of relevant courses.

Beginning in the fall of 1991, students at the University of California at Berkeley will be required to fulfill an "American Cultures" credit.(151) Students will have to choose one course, from an approved list, that compares at least three of the following five racial and ethnic groups: Asian American, European American, Native American, Hispanic American, and African American. L. Lin-chi Wang, chair of the ethnic studies department, and professor of Asian American studies, said this effort is an attempt "to reformulate how we understand the American identity." He said that while few current courses could meet this requirement, faculty development seminars are underway. By next fall, he said, approximately 40 to 50 courses, and within three years, 80 courses that meet the requirement should be available.

Other colleges, including Canisius College in New York and the University of South Carolina, incorporate sections or units on multiculturalism into more general courses. Canisius offers a first-year seminar, which is not a college-wide requirement, that lists "multicultural awareness" as one of its three major concerns.(152) The unit includes lectures, readings and workshops, on subjects ranging from language and culture to the history of black higher education. South Carolina offers "University 101" to its first-year students. Within certain general guidelines, the focus of each section of "University 101" is determined by the instructor, according to John Gardner, vice chancellor for university campuses and continuing education.(153) In an interview with People For the American Way, he said that in addition to the general goal of preparing students to succeed in college, his section examines the history of the university, and its original aims of educating the "white male aristocracy." Gardner said he likes offering it as an elective rather than a requirement because "motivation has so much to do with success," and because of the logistical difficulties a requirement might cause. He said the result of requiring the course could be the "unwilling teaching the uninformed."

CONCLUSION

As noted before, none of the programs described above is an unqualified success. Some, in the beginning stages, will undoubtedly require adjustment and fine-tuning. All require continued support in the form of funding and personnel. Also important, and frequently neglected, is the need to publicize these efforts. The success of these initiatives, projects and programs depends in large part on trust among administrators, faculty and students. If students don't know about a program, they will have a hard time believing the university president's assurances that the school is making the effort.

Serious communication gaps appeared to exist even at institutions doing thorough work on the problem. Students we interviewed at Rutgers did not know about the work of the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes; students trained to do sensitivity workshops at the University of South Carolina did not know about the Carolinian's Creed.

This kind of communication problem not only erodes trust, but also undermines the effort itself. Administrative initiative alone will not accomplish these goals. Efforts to promote multiculturalism and mutual respect must involve students, faculty and staff.

Other colleges need only to extend pieces of their current efforts. The University of Maine could consider using the strategy implemented to combat homophobia as a strategy to deal with racism as well. The University of California at Los Angeles could consider encouraging orientation counselors to initiate discussion of affirmative action, rather than respond only when questions are raised. It is clear that misinformation about the effort is widespread; why not dispel the myths *before* problems occur?

This college generation has been called apathetic time and again. In 1989, People For conducted a study of more than 1000 15-24 year olds which revealed that this generation is "markedly less involved and less interested in public life than previous generations."(154) Yet in the midst of the apathy and indifference, some students are working hard for change. These students are willing to lead workshops in dorms and for student organizations; help faculty rethink their courses; question and protest inconsistencies in policy and procedure; and demand results. Colleges should encourage and support these students by acknowledging that they are taking their responsibilities as members of the community seriously. Unfortunately, as our interviews with student leaders found, college administrators too often dismiss student concerns and thus contribute to the increasing polarization on campus.

On the other hand, colleges must walk a fine line when they make use of students to lead orientation and workshop programs. While student involvement definitely has its place, an institution should be sure that it is not placing the burden of educating and sensitizing students entirely on the shoulders of those students most affected by bigotry and intolerance.

Colleges must also avoid the trap of letting the more involved students, faculty or administrators dictate the terms and parameters of discussion on campus. At some colleges, jokes about what is "politically correct" abound, and students on both the left and the right have attempted to further their views not by open debate, but by protesting the propriety of having certain speakers on campus, or as we demonstrated earlier, by attempting to set boundaries for acceptable speech.

We see on campuses today the clash between those tired of waiting and those afraid of what awaits. Colleges should see it as a sign of strength, not weakness, when students actively question and challenge curricula and college procedures and operations. By asking these questions, black students, gays and lesbians, Hispanics, Asian Americans and women are demonstrating that they know they belong, and also that they have the right to insist that the institution recognize their presence and meet their needs.

Likewise, it is the institutions that are confronting the issues, listening to the challenges and questions, and preparing for change, that are best meeting the goals and ideals of higher education.They do not shift responsibility, but accept it. They do not deny the problems, but acknowledge and confront them. Asked on People For's survey who at the college was responsible for programs designed to fight intolerance and promote mutual respect, Kate Chesley of Clark University's Office of Communications responded, "We are all responsible."(155)

ENDNOTES

Note: "Survey" refers to the questionnaire mailed to deans of student affairs and student newspaper editors.

1. Gloria Yamato, "Something About the Subject Makes It Hard to Name," Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color, edited by Gloria Anzaldua, Aunt Lute Foundation Books, San Francisco, 1990, p. 20.

2. William B. Johnston, Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century, Hudson Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 1987, p. 95.

3. Karen Rowe, University of California at Los Angeles, interviews, June 27 and September 12, 1990.

4. Survey, Western Kentucky University, Kentucky.

5. Survey, Susquehanna University, Pennsylvania.

6. Survey, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

7. Donald Peterson, "Students Speak on Prejudice: A Survey of Intergroup Attitudes and Ethnoviolent Behavior," Rutgers University, for the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes, p. 53.

8. Howard J. Ehrlich, Ph.D., Campus Ethnoviolence and the Policy Options, Institute Report No. 4, National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, March 1990, p.iii.

9. Raymond Goldstone, University of California at Los Angeles, interview, June 14, 1990.

10. Troy Duster, "The Diversity Project: An Interim Report to the Chancellor," Institute for the Study of Social Change, University of California at Berkeley, June 1990, p. 94.

11. Ibid., p. 40.

12. Ibid., p. 79.

13. Ibid., p. 36.

14. Ibid., p. 74.

15. Ibid., p. 74.

16. Susan Rasmussen, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, interviews, undated and September 27, 1990.

17. "Diversity Project," p. 32.

18. Ibid., p. 31.

19. Carol Innerst, "College whites fight 'favoritism,'" Washington Times, April 26, 1990, and interviews. George Ingram, director of the news bureau at Temple University, noted in a recent interview with People For the American Way that the union has been dormant so far this fall. And Mark Wright noted in a more recent interview that the union at the University of Florida has been unable to find a faculty advisor this year.

20. Doug Hernandez, University of Southwestern Louisiana at Lafayette, June 1990; Nolan Pellerin, associate editor, The Vermilion, and Steve Giambrone, faculty advisor, SEARCH, University of Southwestern Louisiana at Lafayette, December 11, 1990.

21. "College whites fight 'favoritism.'"

22. Doug Hernandez, University of Southwestern Louisiana at Lafayette, interviews, June and December 12, 1990.

23. The White American, student newspaper of the White Student Union at Temple University.

24. Mark Wright, University of Florida at Gainesville, interview, June, 1990.

25. Interviews, and Peggy Murray, "Officials to Hear other minority group concerns," State News, June 1, 1989.

26. Liz Krebs, "NETI Drums Up Support," State News, May 11, 1989.

27. Conservative Forum, Human Events, December 3, 1988.

28. Linda Brodkey, University of Texas at Austin, interviews, July 10 and September 12, 1990.

29. Scott Henson and Tom Philpott, "English 306: Reading, Writing and Politics," Austin Chronicle, August 10, 1990.

30. "A Statement of Academic Concern," advertisement in the Daily Texan, July 18, 1990.

31. New York Times, July 29, 1990.

32. Cougar Pause, student newspaper of the College of Charleston, letter to the editor, undated.

33. "Fighting Prejudice in a Large State University," Donald Peterson, presentation to the National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology, San Juan, Puerto Rico, February 1989.

34. Survey, Kutztown University, Pennsylvania.

35. Campus Ethnoviolence and the Policy Options, p. 16, 17.

36. Survey, Memphis State University, Tennessee.

37. Survey, Baylor University, Texas.

38. Patty Kastelic, University of Alaska at Fairbanks, interviews, August and December 10, 1990.

39. Survey, confidential.

40. Survey, Hamilton College, New York.

41. William Geller, University of Maine at Farmington, interviews, April 25 and July 17, 1990.

42. Paul Glasser, Rutgers University, interview, June 1990.

43. L. Lin-chi Wang, "Meritocracy and Diversity in Higher Education: Discrimination Against Asian Americans in the Post-Bakke Era," Urban Review, Vol. 20, No. 3, p. 195.

44. Ibid., p. 199, 200.

45. Grace W. Tsuang, "Assuring Equal Access of Asian Americans to Highly Selective Universities," The Yale Law Journal, Vol. 98:659, 1989, p. 664.

46. Ibid, p. 664.

47. Ibid, p. 664, 5.

48. Ibid, p. 664, 5.

49. "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?" The Project on the Status and Education of Women, a project of the Association of American Colleges, 1982. For this quote, the authors cite:
1) David A. Karp and William C. Yoels, "The College Classroom: Some Observations on the Meanings of Student Participation, "Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 60, No. 4, July 1976, pp. 421-439;
2) Barrie Thorne, "Claiming Verbal Space: Women Speech and Language in College Classrooms," paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley College, September, 1979, p. 15.

50. Kathleen Hirsch, "Fraternities of Fear: Gang Rape, Male Bonding, and the Silencing of Women," Ms., September/October 1990, p. 52. Hirsch also writes:

> [O]ne out of four women will be sexually assaulted on a

college campus. At the very most, only one in ten of those will report it. Their attackers will be fellow students 80 percent of the time, and the most likely location of the attack will be a dormitory room or a fraternity house.

51. Ibid.

52. Letty Pryor, University of Maine at Farmington, interview, July 17, 1990.

53. Survey, Harvey Mudd College, California.

54. Interviews, University of Georgia, and "A Student Group Works to End Harassment," New York Times, June 3, 1990.

55. Vanessa Williams, University of Georgia, interview, June 13, 1990.

56. Eric Gorski and Jonathan Plummer, "Protesters descend on Strong: Budig outlines steps to end racial discord," Daily Kansan, University of Kansas, April 12, 1990.

57. David Ambler, University of Kansas, interviews.

58. Still Burning: Confronting Ethnoviolence On Campus, the University of Maryland at Baltimore County, Department of Instructional Technology and University Police.

59. Lenora Barnes-Wright, College of Wooster, interviews.

60. Joseph Franek, State University of New York at Brockport, interview, July 9, 1990.

61. Joel Tolliver, State University of New York at Brockport, interviews, July 6 and September 26, 1990.

62. "Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources and Education 1988-89 Annual Report," July 1, 1988-June 30, 1989, Myra Hindus, director, and, "Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault: Creating A Campus Program," Princeton University.

63. "Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault: Creating A Campus Program."

64. "Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources and Education 1988-89 Annual Report." July 1, 1988-June 30, 1989, Myra Hindus, director.

65. Norimitsu Onishi, "Protesters end occupation, fail to achieve prinicipal goal," The Daily Princetonian, April 26, 1990.

66. Arthur Sandeen, University of Florida, interview, June, 1990.

67. "Report of the Quality of Life Task Force on African-American And Hispanic Students," Dr. Gerardo Gonzalez, associate professor od education, and Dr. Simon Johnson, professor of education, co-chairs, University of Florida, Gainesville, April 1990.

68. Ibid., p. 4.

69. Ibid., p. 3.

70. James Fitzsimmons, Temple University, interviews, June and September 27, 1990.

71. Denys Blell, Case Western Reserve University, interviews, June and October 1, 1990. (Blell now works at Siena College, New York.)

72. "How to Handle Hate on Campus," New York Times, editorial, December 13, 1989.

73. Ibid.

74. Memo to participants in Annenberg Washington Program Workshop on Campus Racist and Sexist Speech.

75. David Ambler, University of Kansas, interviews, June 23 and October 2, 1990.

76. Lenora Barnes-Wright, College of Wooster, interviews, August and October 1, 1990.

77. "Report of Workshop on Racist and Sexist Speech on College and University Campuses," held at the Annenberg Washington Program of Northwestern University, Washington, D.C., April 12, 1990, and accompanying press release.

78. Ibid.

79. Ibid., p. 2.

80. Campus Life: In Search of Community, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton University Press, 1990, p. 22.

81. Ibid.

82. Jon Weiner, "Free Speech for Campus Bigots: Words That Wound," The Nation, February 26, 1990. And, Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire.

83. The Nation.

84. Ibid. The controversy, however, split even the ACLU. See Nat Hentoff, "If a Civil Liberties Union Can't Agree on Free Speech...," Washington Post, June 2, 1990, and "What's Happening

to the ACLU?" Village Voice, May 15, 1990.

85. "Report of Workshop on Racist and Sexist Speech on College and University Campuses."

86. Ibid.

87. Ibid., and Jana Dozier, "Codes designed to combat racism might trip over the First Amendment," AGB Report: The Journal of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Vol. 32, No. 1, January/February 1990.

88. Ibid.

89. Memo to participants in Annenberg Program Workshop on Campus Racist and Sexist Speech.

90. "The Diversity Project," p. 98.

91. Ibid., p. 98.

92. Ibid., p. 94.

93. "The Consequences of Being Gay: A Report on the Quality of Life for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Students at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst," prepared by Felice Yeskel, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, 1985.

94. Ibid., p. 20.

95. Felice Yeskel, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, interview, July 1990, and "The Program for Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Concerns" (pamphlet).

96. "Rutgers Sexual Orientation Survey: A Report on the Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Members of the Rutgers Community," Dr. Susan Cavin, director, 1988.

97. "In Every Classroom: Report of the President's Select Committee for Lesbian and Gay Concerns," James D. Anderson, chairperson, and Ronald A. Nieberding, editor, Rutgers University, 1989.

98. Ibid.

99. Ibid., p. 39.

100. Ibid., p. 41.

101. Ibid., p. 46.

102. "Students Speak on Prejudice," p. 53.

103. "The Madison Plan," University of Wisconsin at Madison, February 1988.

104. "Complaints Reported -- University of Wisconsin at Madison."

105. "Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research." William E. Sedlacek, Journal of College Student Personnel, November 1987.

106. "White Student Attitudes Toward Blacks and Hispanics: Programming Implications." Timothy J. White and William E. Sedlacek, Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, October 1987.

107. "University Student Attitudes Toward Arabs: Implications for Programmatic Intervention." Research Report #6-89, Marie T. Sargent, Paula Woods, and William E. Sedlacek, Counseling Center, Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Maryland at College Park.

108. "Student Attitudes Toward 'JAPS': The New Anti-Semitism." Research Report #9-89, Susan J. Schwalb and William E. Sedlacek, Counseling Center, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Maryland at College Park.

109. "Sexual Harassment Education Resource Manual." Prepared by Dr. Gladys Brown, Director, Office of the President, Office of Human Relations Programs, and accompanying letter from president, University of Maryland at College Park.

110. "Rutgers ROTC aid cut to protest ban on gays," Washington Times, August 24, 1990.

111. Don Wycliff, "Women as Presidents: Shalala Takes Charge At University of Wisconsin," New York Times, August 15, 1990.

112. Jerry Crotty, University of South Carolina, interviews, undated and September 27, 1990.

113. "The Carolinian's Creed," University of South Carolina.

114. Jerry Crotty, University of South Carolina, interviews.

115. Bruce Barbee, University of California at Los Angeles, interviews, August and October 2, 1990.

116. Susan Rasmussen, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, interviews.

117. "Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes," description of program. The description says the committee works to "assess patterns of prejudice, to administer a grant program for students and student organizations, and to improve multi-cultural understanding through course work, honors programs, staff

development, student interactions, and community relations." The committee comes out of the original program, called the Program to Advance Our Common Purposes.

118. Ibid.

119. Grant Program of the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes, Rutgers University, description of program.

120. Paul Glasser, Rutgers University, interview.

121. William Geller, presentation to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, New Orleans, March 1990.

122. Survey, University of Maine at Farmington, and William Geller, interviews.

123. "Program - Lesbians/Gays: Helping A Campus Understand; Looking For New Attitudes," handout for NASPA presentation.

124. William Geller, "Challenge to Challenge."

125. Dennis Kelly, "Dropout rate for blacks declines," USA Today, June 20, 1990.

126. "Graduate Studies at Duke: Opportunities for Minorities," Graduate School Recruiting Office.

127. Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity, p. 81.

128. "The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students," the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, October 1986, p. 2.

129. "The University of Michigan King/Chavez/Parks Yearbook, 1988-1989," University of Michigan, Office of Minority Affairs.

130. Ibid.

131. "Beyond Diversity: The Newsletter," Office of Minority Affairs, The University of Michigan, Special Edition, 1988, p. 4.

132. KCP Yearbook.

133. "Freshman Admissions at Berkeley: A Policy for the 1990s and Beyond," Report by the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, Berkeley Division, Academic Senate, University of California, Professor Jerome Karabel, chair, May 1989.

134. "Diversity Project," p. 100.

135. Renato Rosaldo, Stanford University, interviews, and "Europe and the Americas," syllabus, Area One (CIV) course proposed by Mary Pratt, Gregson Davis, Renato Rosaldo, and Kennell Jackson, University of California at Berkeley.

136. "New Courses to Focus on Cultural Diversity," New York Times, December 9, 1990.

137. "Berkeley Undergraduates to Take Course on Ethnic Groups," New York Times, May 2, 1989.

138. Ibid.

139. Ken Hunt, "ESR Task Force completes recommendations," The Daily of the University of Washington," May 24, 1990.

140. Karen De Witt, "Student Protest Movement Expands, and Its Voice Is That of the Consumer," New York Times, October 17, 1990.

141. Karen Rowe, University of California at Los Angeles, interviews.

142. Rowe, interviews, and "Integration of Ethnic Women into UCLA's Liberal Arts Curriculum," submitted to the Ford Foundation by the UCLA Center for the Study of Women, Karen Rowe, director and principal investigator, April 1988. p. 2.

143. Executive Summary, "Integration of the Scholarship Derived from Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies into General Education Courses in the Humanities and the Social Sciences," University of California at Los Angeles, Edward A. Alpers and Helen S. Astin, co-directors.

144. Bruce Schulman, University of California at Los Angeles, interviews, June and September 12, 1990.

145. "Making A Difference for Women: Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Women's Education," University of Maryland at College Park, Dr. Sandra C. Greer, chair, April 25, 1988.

146. Ibid., p. 9.

147. "Curriculum Transformation Project at UMCP: Report on the 1989 Summer Faculty Institute, Thinking About Women."

148. Ibid., p. 1.

149. Ibid., p. 3.

150. Ibid., p. 6-8.

151. L. Lin-chi Wang, University of California at Berkeley, interview, August 1990.

152. LLL-107, Freshman Seminar, Canisius College, course description and syllabus. Also, interviews with Jerome Neuner, associate vice president for academic affairs.

153. John Gardner, University of South Carolina, interview, June 15, 1990.

154. "Democracy's Next Generation: A Study of Youth and Teachers," People For the American Way, 1989.

155. Survey, Clark University, Massachusetts.

APPENDIX A

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY
Campus Intolerance Clearinghouse

This questionnaire is designed to collect data on incidents of harassment or violence based on race, religion, gender, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. It will be used to establish a clearinghouse on campus intolerance and to provide guidance and support in planning institutional responses.

Please enclose any supporting material, such as reports, program descriptions, policy statements and curriculum guidelines. Your cooperation is essential to the project's success and will be greatly appreciated.

****

College or University:_____
Your name:_____
Title:_____
Phone number:_____

Name, title, & phone number of campus official responsible for anti-harassment programs, if different from above:_____
_____
_____

Size of undergraduate student body:_____

****

1) Is intolerance based on race, religion, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, or gender a problem on your campus? If yes, can you identify any contributing factors? If no, can you suggest why this is so?_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2) Please describe, in specific terms, any recent (within the last 18 months) incidents on campus of violence or harassment based on race, sex, disability, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation: _____

3a) What was the formal institutional response to these incidents? _____

3b) Is there any data or information on the impact of this institutional response? Please provide an anecdotal report if no formal document or report exists. _____

4) Does the college/university run any programs to counter intolerance and promote mutual respect on campus? If so, please explain how the program works, who designed it, who is involved and how well it seems to be working:_____

5) When these incidents occurred, how did students react? Were there spontaneous protests, meetings with the administration, or other actions?_____

6a) Has this institution established a policy to monitor and/or punish harassment or defamatory speech? If so, please describe:

6b) Have any obstacles or problems arisen from this policy? Explain:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7) What additional kinds of information or assistance would be helpful to you in preventing or responding to acts of intolerance on campus?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please attach additional comments and suggestions. Also indicate if you would like any of the information you have provided to remain confidential. And, again, thank you for your assistance.

Please return to: Leonard Steinhorn
Campus Intolerance Project
People For the American Way
2000 M Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

For more information, call: (202) 467-4999

This project is made possible in part by a generous grant from the Cummins Engine Foundation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

SURVEY BREAKDOWN

The Questionnaire

In late March 1990, People For the American Way sent approximately 2300 questionnaires to deans of student affairs and 2000 to student newspaper editors. We received 83 questionnaires from 81 institutions -- 74 from administrators and 9 from editors. More than 460,000 students are enrolled at the institutions represented by the questionnaire.

Who responded?

Regional Breakdown:

Northeast - 24
(CT, DC, DE, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)

South - 31
(AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV)

Midwest - 17
(IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)

West - 11
(AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, WY)

36 states represented:

AZ - 1	NH - 1	
AR - 2	NJ - 1	
CA - 4	NY - 7	
CO - 1	NC - 2	
FL - 2	OH - 2	
GA - 4	OK - 1	
HI - 1	PA - 9	
IL - 4	RI - 1	
IN - 2	SC - 5	(2 responses from same school)
IA - 1	SD - 1	
KY - 3	TN - 2	
ME - 1	TX - 7	
MD - 2	UT - 1	
MA - 1	VT - 1	
MI - 1	VA - 1	
MN - 1	WA - 2	(2 responses from same school)
MO - 1	WV - 2	
MT - 1	WI - 4	

School Size:

0 - 2500 students	- 42
2501 - 5000	- 11
5001 - 10,000	- 12
10,001 +	- 18

The surveys that were sent to deans of student affairs were returned from administrators in a variety of offices, including: judicial affairs, student affairs, student life, student development, student activities, residential life, minority affairs, multicultural affairs, and affirmative action.

What did they say?

* Asked whether intolerance based on race, religion, ethnicity, sex, disability, or sexual orientation was a problem on campus:

- 46 said yes
- 31 said no

Some respondents specified the nature of the problem:

- 5 said gender
- 11 said race
- 8 said ethnicity
- 14 said sexual orientation
- 1 said disability
- 1 said age

* Asked if there had been any incidents of intolerance on campus within the past 18 months:

- 48 reported at least one incident
- 31 reported no incidents

Some specified the nature of the incident:

- 16 said gender
- 22 said race
- 1 said ethnicity
- 14 said sexual orientation
- 6 said religion

* Asked if the campus ran any programs designed to counter intolerance and promote mutual respect:

- 24 said yes
- 25 reported programs of limited scope (programs that consisted, for example, only of a discussion at orientation, or "awareness weeks")
- 33 said no

* Nine respondents said intolerance was not a problem on campus, but then went on to describe at least one incident.

* Eight said intolerance was a problem on campus, but reported no incidents.

* Thirty-one of the 48 that reported an incident said the campus ran either no program or a limited program to counter intolerance.

* Thirteen that reported no incidents said the campus does run some program to counter intolerance.

* Eleven that reported at least one incident said there was no formal institutional response to it.

* All nine editors said intolerance was a problem to some degree on their campuses. As a group, they were more uniformly critical of college efforts to promote mutual respect and counter intolerance, and reported either no response to specific incidents, or said they were unaware of any official response. All nine reported at least one incident, and not one described a comprehensive program designed to counter intolerance.

The Interviews

We conducted 151 interviews with administrators, faculty and students representing 58 colleges and universities, 11 of which were also represented by the questionnaire. The figures in parentheses show the number of institutions represented by both the questionnaire and interviews. More than 590,000 students are enrolled at the institutions represented by interviews.

Northeast - 15 (4)
(CT, DC, DE, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)

South - 7 (2)
(AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV)

Midwest - 18 (4)
(IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)

West - 7 (1)
(AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, WY)

29 states represented

CT - 3		IN - 2	
DE - 1		IA - 1	
ME -	(1)	KS - 1	
MA - 3	(1)	MI - 3	(1)
NJ - 2	(1)	MN - 2	
NY - 1	(1)	MO - 1	
PA - 4		NE - 1	
AL - 1		OH - 5	(2)
FL - 1		WI - 2	
GA - 2		AK - 1	
LA - 1		AZ -	(1)
MC -	(1)	CA - 4	
SC -	(1)	WA - 1	
IL -	(1)	OR - 1	

Size

0 - 2500	- 9	(3)
2501 - 5000	- 7	(4)
5001 - 10000	- 7	(3)
10,001 +	- 24	(1)

In total, the schools surveyed represent 44 states.

APPENDIX C

DIRECTORY OF MATERIALS

Below is a list of some of the materials we have collected from colleges and universities around the country. Inclusion in the directory is not meant to suggest People For the American Way's endorsement of the program or effort.

Arizona State University

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Office of the Dean
Tempe, Arizona 85287

"Race Relations in Higher Education: The Case of Arizona State University," Leonard Gordon. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, August, 1990, Washington, DC. Will appear as a chapter in The Racial Crisis in Higher Education, Philip G. Altbach and Kofi Lomotey, editors, in 1991, published by the State University of New York Press.

Brown University

Office of Student Life
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
(401) 863-2251

Racism at Brown (pamphlet)
Sexual Harassment (pamphlet)

Bryn Mawr College

Office of Public Information
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010
(215) 526-5135

"Building on the Strength of Pluralism," statement by Mary Patterson McPherson, president
"Statement of the Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment Policies of Bryn Mawr College," January 1990

Case Western Reserve University

Office of Student Affairs
Yost Hall
10900 Euclid
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(216) 368-2020

"Redefining Excellence in Higher Education: Some Recommendations in Response to the Pluralist Imperative at Case Western Reserve University." Report submitted by Denys Santos Blell, associate dean of student affairs for minority affairs.

Clark University

Office of Communications
950 Main Street
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610-1477
(508) 793-7441

"The University as a Pluralistic Community," statement by Richard P. Traina, president

Colby College

Office of the President
Eustis 301A
Waterville, Maine 04901
(207) 872-3214

"The President's Task Force on Increasing Racial Understanding and Tolerance at Colby," final report

Denison University

Office of the Dean of Student Life
Granville, Ohio 43023
(614) 587-6208

Sexual Assault Policy

Duke University

Office of Residential Life
205 Flowers Building
Durham, North Carolina 27706
(919) 684-3913

"Duke's Vision" (explanation of principles)
"Human Community 101 Examination Book," survey designed to increase awareness of "beliefs, attitudes and behaviors"

Office of the President
207 Allen Building
Durham, North Carolina 27706
(919) 684-2424

1989 welcoming address, President H. Keith Brodie, reprinted in the Chronicle of Higher Education, September 27, 1989

Graduate School Recruiting Office
127 Allen Building
Durham, North Carolina 27706
(919) 684-3913

Graduate Studies at Duke: Opportunities for Minorities (pamphlet)

Marquette University

Office of Affirmative Action
Milawukee, Wisconsin 53233
(414) 288-3430

Sexual Harassment Policy
Racial Abuse and Harassment Policy
Discrimination Complaint Report Form

Massachusetts Institute for Technology

Quality Education for Minorities Project
MIT Room 26-153
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
(617) 253-4417

"Education That Works: An Action Plan for the Education of Minorities," January 1990 (for a copy, send a self-addressed, 10" X 12" envelope, stamped with $2.40 postage)

Northern Arizona University

New Momentum
P.O. Box 4085
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-4085
(602) 523-9557

Northern Arizona's "New Momentum" initiative "proposes to undertake a systematic, culturally sensitive, long-term community partnership program to improve the educational and economic opportunities of American Indians."

"A New Momentum in American Indian Education and Economic Development"

Office of the President
P.O. Box 4092
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-4092
(602) 523-3232

"The Vision and the Will ... Northern Arizona University's Commitment to Cultural Diversity," by Eugene M. Hughes, president

Ohio State University

Robert Arnold
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(614) 292-5881

A Model Curriculum developed by the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum review in Arts and Sciences and Approved by the Faculty of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, the Ohio State University, June 8, 1988

Pennsylvania State University at University Park

Division of Campus Life
135 Boucker Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
(814) 865-0181

Resident Assistant Training Manual
Acts of Intolerance - Model for Management
Policy Statement on Intolerance

Princeton University

The President's Room
1 Nassau Hall
Princeton, New Jersey 08544
(609) 258-6100

"Report to the President of the Ad Hoc Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bi-sexual Needs and Concerns," May 14, 1990
Women's Advisory Board Study Committee on the Status of Women, report and recommendations, March 23, 1989
"The Report of the Special Committee on the ROTC, Military Recruitment and the University Equal Opportunity Policy," November 1989

Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources and Education (SHARE) Office
McCosh Help Center
3rd Floor
Princeton, New Jersey 08544
(609) 258-3310

The SHARE program recruits and trains student to work as peer educators who, along with trained resident advisors, lead information and discussion sessions on acquaintance rape with all first-year students during orientation week. The office also provides individual and group counseling for survivors of sexual assault and advice on disciplinary and legal options.

"Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault: Creating a Campus Program"
"SHARE Program: Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources, and Education," 1988-89 Annual Report," July 1, 1988 - June 30, 1989
"Student Statement on SHARE"

Rutgers University

Rutgers University has published a number of surveys and studies on the subject of intolerance and intergroup relations. Several continuing programs designed to counter intolerance and promote mutual respect are organized under the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes.

Department of Student Life Policy and Services
Van Nest Hall, Room 301
College Avenue
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
(201) 932-7084

"Students Speak on Prejudice: A Survey of Intergroup Attitudes and Ethnoviolent Behavior Among Undergraduate Students at Rutgers University," Donald R. Peterson for the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes
The Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes. Description of program
Announcement for the Grant Program of the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes
"In Every Classroom: The Report of the President's Select Committee for Lesbian and Gay Concerns" ($10)

Douglas Advisory Services for Women
132 George Street
Douglas College
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
(201) 932-9603

"Rutger's Sexual Orientation Survey, April 8, 1987: A Report on the Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Members of the Rutgers Community," Dr. Susan Cavin

Smith College

Office of College Relations
Northampton, Massachusetts 01063
(413) 585-2170

"Smith Design for Institutional Diversity"

Stanford University

Program in Cultures, Ideas and Values (CIV)
Building 200-031
Stanford, California 94305-2024
(415) 723-0944

Stanford recently restructured its first-year requirement. Formerly a western culture course, it is now called Cultures, Ideas and Values.

Core reading list for Western Culture Program in use from 1979-1988
Program in Cultures, Ideas and Values, required readings 1990-91

Description of Cultures, Ideas and Values requirement, as adopted by the Senate of the Academic Council, March 31, 1988
Description of different course sequences offered by CIV Program

Department of Anthropology
Building 110
Room 111D
Stanford, California 94305
(415) 723-3421

"Europe and the Americas": Area One (CIV) course proposed by: Mary Pratt; Gregson Davis; Renato Rosaldo; Kennell Jackson

University of California at Berkeley

Office of Admissions and Enrollment
221 Sproul Hall
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-3175

The University of California at Berkeley recently published a survey of attitudes about race and ethnicity on campus and a review of university admissions policies. The "Diversity Project" found that affirmative action often becomes the source of a great deal of misunderstanding and tension, and recommends that the university "reformulate the discourse" about the program.

"The Diversity Project: An Interim Report to the Chancellor," Troy Duster, Institute for the Study of Social Change, June 1990
"Freshman Admissions at Berkeley: A Policy for the 1990s and Beyond," report by the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, Berkeley Division, Academic Senate, Professor Jerome Karabel, chair, May 19, 1989

University of California at Los Angeles

Office of Honors and Undergraduate Programs
405 Hilgard Avenue
A-316 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, California 90024-1430
(213) 825-1687

The University of California at Los Angeles runs seminars for faculty interested in expanding their courses to include traditionally neglected cultures and perspectives.

"Incorporating Ethnic and Gender Studies into the Curriculum: The Experience at UCLA"
"Final Report: Integration of the Scholarship Derived from Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies into General Education Course in the Humanities and the Social Sciences," by Dean

Edward A. Alpers, Professor Valerie Matsumoto, Professor Karen Rowe
"Integration of Ethnic Women into UCLA's Liberal Arts Curriculum," submitted to Ford Foundation, April 1988

Orientation Program
Hendrick Hall
250 De Neve Ave.
Los Angeles, California 90024
(213) 206-6685

Orientation Packet - compilation of essays, fact-sheets, etc. which includes:
"Dispelling the Mythology of Aquaintance Rape," by Suzanne O'Connell, M.S.W.
"Rape: The Silent Survivors," by Ana Toro, Ph.D. and Kathy Rose-Mockry
"When Someone You Know Has AIDS," by Jim Babl, Ph.D.
"Coming Out," by Jim Babl, Ph.D.

University of Florida at Gainesville

Division of Student Affairs
124 Tigert Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611
(904) 392-1274

Standard of Ethical Conduct for the University of Florida Commission (findings of task force headed by Sam Hill)
"Report of the Quality of Life Task Force on African-American and Hispanic Students," April 1990

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Office of the Dean of Students
Student Services Building
610 East John Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

"Sexually Stressful Events Survey," summary report submitted by Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, assistant dean of students and project director, and Carolyn J. Palmer, assistant professor, health and safety studies, January 22, 1990

University of Maine at Farmington

Office of Educational Services
Farmington, Maine 04938
(207) 778-3501 ext.254

William Geller, director of educational services, has compiled a variety of descriptions and summaries of efforts at the university to initiate discussion of intolerance. Some of these

include:

"Students and Educators: Attitudes on Gay and Lesbian Matters"
"Lesbians/Gays: Helping a Campus Understand, Looking for New Attitudes," handout for presentation to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, New Orleans March 1990
"Men: Where Are You?" description of efforts to increase awareness among men of violence against women and sexual harassment

University of Maryland at Baltimore County

Instructional Media Resources
Catonsville, Maryland 21228
(301) 455-3208

Still Burning: Confronting Ethnoviolence on Campus, videotape, one version for administrators, resident assistants and staff, and one for students

University of Maryland at College Park

Office of the President
1101 Main Administration Building
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-5794

The University of Maryland at College Park has reviewed the campus climate from the perspective of women students and has developed faculty seminars to encourage faculty to expand their courses to include traditionally neglected perspectives.

"Curriculum Transformation Project at UMCP: Report on the 1989 Summer Faculty Institute, Thinking About Women"
Interdisciplinary Seminar: Thinking About Women, selected materials
Sexual Harassment Education Resource Manual

Professor Sandra Greer
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Chemistry Building
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 454-2607

"Making a Difference for Women: Report on the Committee of Undergraduate Women's Education," April 25, 1988

Counseling Center
Office of Testing, Research, and Data Processing
Shoemaker Building
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 314-7687

The Counseling Center conducts research on issues of prejudice and social change. Some recent articles are:

"Student Attitudes Toward 'JAPs': The New Anti-Semitism"
"University Student Attitudes Towards Arabs: Implications for Programmatic Intervention"
"The Situational Attitude Scale - Women (SASW): A Means to Measure Environmental Sexism"
"Institutional Racism and How to Handle It"

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

The Program for Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Concerns
c/o Residential Education West
117 Cance Southwest
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003
(413) 545-4824

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst reported on the quality of campus life for gay and lesbian students and has since established the Program for Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Concerns.

"The Consequences of Being Gay: A Report on the Quality of Life for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Students at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst," prepared by Felice Yeskel
Straight Talk About Homosexuality (pamphlet)

University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

Comprehensive Studies Program
1042 Fleming Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
(313) 764-9128

"Comprehensive Studies Program New Student Resource Guide"

Office of Affirmative Action
2012 Fleming Administration Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
(313) 764-3423

In 1990, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor published a comprehensive outline of goals for the institution, with corresponding timelines, including efforts to recruit minority students and faculty.

"The Michigan Mandate: A Strategic Linking of Academic Excellence and Social Diversity," March 1990
"King/Chavez/Parks Yearbook 1988-89," description of minority student and faculty recruitment effort

University of South Carolina

Division of Student Affairs

Department of Student Development and Educational Services
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
(803) 777-5116

At the end of the 1989-90 academic year, the University of South Carolina published "The Carolinian's Creed" as a way of inculcating a sense of shared values and expectations. The creed will be introduced in first-year "University 101" classes.

"The Carolinian's Creed"
"Proceedings: The Freshman Year Experience Conference - Special Focus: Building Foundations for Cultural Diversity," January 25-27, 1990. Contains descriptions of various first-year seminars from colleges around the country.

University of Texas at Austin

Office of the Dean of Students
Campus Activities Office
Texas Union, 4304
Austin, Texas 78713-7338
(512) 471-3065

"Report of President's Ad Hoc Committee on Racial Harassment," November 27, 1989
"From Dream to Reality: Multicultural Programming for the 1990s," Consuelo Trevino, presentation to National Association of Personnel Administrators, regional conference, March 14-17, 1990
"A Multicultural University Resource Guide"

Lower Division Department of English
PAR 108
Austin, Texas 78712-1164
(512) 471-4991

The University of Texas weathered a controversy over the restructuring of a first-year writing course. The change would have shifted the focus of reading and writing assignments to anti-discrimination law, but some opponents considered it too political. The change was delayed for a year.

"Tentative Syllabus, Fall Semester 1990 English 306: Rhetoric and Composition 'Writing About Difference'"

University of Washington

Associated Students of the University of Washington
Board of Control
HUB 204L FK-30
Seattle, Washington 48195
(206) 543-1780

"The Task Force on Racism of the Associated Students of the

University of Washington Report to the University: Racism and Discrimination in the College Environment," spring 1989

University of Wisconsin at Madison

Office of the Chancellor
158 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(608) 262-9946

"The Madison Plan" is an outline of the university's goals in areas such as recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty.

"The Madison Plan," February 9, 1988
"Madison Plan Progress," February 1989
"The Madison Plan Two Years Later," February, 1990

Office of the Dean of Students
117 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(608) 263-5700

Racism at the UW-Madison - Let Us Know! (pamphlet)
"Complaints Reported: University of Wisconsin"

Race Relations Education Project
128 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Race Awareness Committee/Race Relations Education Program (pamphlet)

University of Wisconsin at Whitewater

Office of Vice Chancellor for Affirmative Action
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190-1790
(414) 472-4672

Student Non-Academic Disciplinary Laws and Grievance Procedures

Washington University in St. Louis

Office of the Provost
Campus Box 1080
1 Brookings Drive
St. Louis, Missouri 63130-4899
(314) 889-5151

Resolution to Faculty Council Concerning ROTC

Yale University

Office of Public Affairs
149 York Street
Second Floor
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

"Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression at Yale," C. Vann Woodward, chair, January 8, 1975
"The Report of the Committee to Study Freedom of Expression at Yale, 1989," Robert K. Adair, chair